

NEW SERIES

THE CLERGY REVIEW  
PUBLISHED MONTHLY  
Price Two Shillings Net  
Vol. XV, No. 6

# THE CLERGY REVIEW

DECEMBER, 1938

---

## CONTENTS INCLUDE

FAITH AND MOTIVES OF CREDIBILITY  
BY REV. AELRED GRAHAM, O.S.B.

ST. ELEUTHERIUS AND THE CONVERSION  
OF BRITAIN  
BY VERY REV. CANON J. ARENDZEN

NEWMAN: THE PREACHER  
BY J. LEWIS MAY

HOMILETICS  
BY REV. L. L. McREAVY

NOTES ON RECENT WORK  
I—ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY  
II—PASTORAL THEOLOGY

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS  
REVIEWS, &c.

---

LONDON  
BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE LTD.  
PUBLISHERS TO THE HOLY SEE  
43-45 NEWGATE STREET, E.C.1  
Price Two Shillings Net

---

You can  
TRUST

The  
**TABLET**

for

- Inside knowledge of foreign affairs.
- Balanced views on vital topics.
- Despatches from foreign capitals.
- The fullest and best book reviews.
- Humour and Satire.

**THE OLDEST AND PREMIER  
CATHOLIC WEEKLY : 6<sup>d</sup>.**

Send a postcard for a free specimen copy  
**THE TABLET, 39 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.4**

---

---

R  
d.

C.4



# THE CLERGY REVIEW

---

*Chairman of the Editorial Board:*

Most Reverend Archbishop Downey

*Editor:*

Very Reverend Canon T. E. Flynn, V.F.

Submission of articles of direct practical interest to the pastoral clergy is invited. Submission of cases in Moral Theology, Canon Law, and Liturgy is invited, also *dubia* in Dogmatic Theology and Holy Scripture. Correspondence on solutions that have appeared, and on any matters of pastoral interest, is invited.

Matter offered for publication may be sent direct, to save time, to the Editor at St. Mary's, Chorley, Lancs.

Other correspondence should be sent to the Manager,

THE CLERGY REVIEW  
BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE LTD.  
43-45 NEWGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.1

---

*Subscription Rates for twelve monthly numbers:*

£1 OR FIVE DOLLARS POST FREE  
SINGLE NUMBERS TWO SHILLINGS

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECEMBER, 1938

## ARTICLES :

	PAGE
(1) Faith and the Motives of Credibility BY REV. DOM. AELRED GRAHAM, O.S.B.	471
(2) St. Eleutherius and the Conversion of Britain BY VERY REV. CANON J. ARENDZEN, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.	485
(3) Newman : the Preacher BY J. LEWIS MAY	497
(4) The Oldest Christmas Carol BY REV. CHARLES A. BOLTON	509

## HOMILETICS :

The Sundays of January BY REV. LAWRENCE LESLIE McREAVY, D.C.L., M.A.	513
----------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

## NOTES ON RECENT WORK :

(1) Ascetical and Mystical Theology BY REV. J. CARTMELL, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.	528
(2) Pastoral Theology BY VERY REV. CANON T. E. FLYNN, V.F., Ph.D., M.A.	532

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS :

(1) Homily on the Gospel By VERY REV. CANON E. J. MAHONEY, D.D.	537
(2) Baptism—Parochial Right	538
(3) Communicatio in Sacris	540
(4) Precedence in Receiving Holy Communion	541
(5) Standing During “Credo”	543
(6) “I Christen Thee”	544
(7) Immodest Dress	545

## ROMAN DOCUMENTS . . . . .

548

## CHURCH MANAGEMENT . . . . .

551

## BOOK REVIEWS . . . . .

554

## CORRESPONDENCE . . . . .

562

# The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XV, No. 6.

DEC., 1938

PAGE  
471

## FAITH AND THE MOTIVES OF CREDIBILITY

485

THE task incumbent upon the faithful of giving a reason for their belief surely attains its maximum of difficulty when the *praeambula fidei*, the mental processes which immediately precede the act of faith, are under discussion. Nor can it be said that the experts are as helpful as might be wished ; the ordinary dogmatic manuals dismiss the problems involved in the most summary fashion, and one or two recent *ex professo* treatments of the subject betray the limitations, as well as the advantages, of the literary and aesthetic, as distinct from the strictly theological, approach.

497

509

513

528

532

537

538

540

541

543

544

545

548

551

554

562

No clearer instance of the important practical consequences implicit in what might appear a purely speculative question could be forthcoming than the distinction to be drawn between what the theologians call the "motive of faith" and the "motives of credibility". In the first place, it is a distinction which underlies the entire process of the Church's apologetic in so far as this is to be distinguished from the science of theology properly so called, and secondly, it offers the only means of refuting the most penetrating of all objections to our position : the charge that, despite the avowed antagonism of Rome to liberty of choice in religious matters, the Catholic Faith is itself based in the last resort upon that very private judgement which it professes to condemn.

Although what follows has its application to every revealed doctrine proposed by the Church for the acceptance of the faithful, including—and this is noteworthy—the Catholic conception of the nature of the Church and of faith itself, let us take for the sake of simplicity the central Christian mystery, the

Personality of Christ as ultimately to be defined by the Fathers of Chalcedon. We believe that Christ our Lord possessed the perfection of both divine and human natures in the unique Personality of the Son of God. On what grounds do we so believe? Clearly for the reason that it has been divinely revealed. And what assurance have we of this? Are we to reply here, explicitly or in equivalent terms, "We have the guarantee afforded by the motives of credibility"?<sup>1</sup> If this is all that can be said, then either the motives of credibility are themselves assented to by supernatural faith—which is tantamount to fideism (i.e. the denial of the probative force of those motives: a position condemned by the Church), or, being held on rational grounds alone, the "faith" which ensues can be no more than what reason justifies—an equally impossible admission. We must then look further than the motives of credibility, while in no way underestimating their value, since we have to maintain that the act of faith is itself eminently reasonable. We have to inquire what happens within the mind in its passage from the acceptance of the motives of credibility to the assent of faith.

Bearing in mind the mystery to which assent is ultimately to be given, let us suppose that our inquirer is convinced of the historicity of the gospels, that he experiences no undue difficulty about the miracles there recorded and perceives in Jesus the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, that further he recognizes the claim to divinity and is convinced of the integrity of him who makes that claim, in a word, that he appreciates the motives of credibility both individually and in their cumulative force. He is now in a position in which he realizes his obligation to believe. Supposing that at this point faith supervenes

<sup>1</sup> Obviously it will not silence an objector to make answer, "On the authority of the Church"; for his next inquiry will be, "How do we know that the Church possesses this authority?" To which, of course, it would only be begging the question to reply, "On the authority of revelation."

and he assents to the revealed dogma, then the questions immediately arise : What support do the motives of credibility now give to his new mental state ? What change has resulted in the mind by the infusion of the supernatural virtue of faith ?

It has been argued that the effect of faith upon the reasons which led the inquirer along the way (i.e. the motives of credibility) is to take them up into the new act so that they are seen with a new force and conviction. Before the act of faith his mind is not made up, but on attaining the conviction that God has spoken, he sees that the external evidence points in one way and one way only, and the same evidence comes alive at the sign which immediately reveals a divine presence and a divine communication.

Now it may surely be questioned whether we have here, even in outline, a satisfactory account of what takes place. If this were so, the assent of faith would still seem to repose fundamentally upon the antecedent investigation, that is, upon historical evidence and the findings of reason. No matter how great the insight given to the mind in contemplating their significance or how much the will is strengthened to adhere to them, the motives of credibility cannot suddenly transform themselves into a sanction for divine faith. They still retain their essential nature of being the rational foundation of the judgement *I ought to believe*, not the supernatural justification of the quite different judgement *I believe*. Nor, in fact, as has also been maintained, is the judgement in respect of the validity of these motives surrendered in the act of acknowledgement which faith involves. It is still possible, and very necessary for the theologian and apologist, to weigh with detachment the worth of the motives of credibility while adhering to the truths concerned with the unqualified acceptance of faith. That not a few among the theologians have failed conspicuously to realize the distinction between the

rational credibility of the revealed mysteries as evident to reason and their supernatural credibility as seen under the light of faith, have even imagined that the transition from one to the other can be reached in the conclusion of a syllogism, provides a warning against undue simplification of the question while at the same time inviting us to inquiry.

In the *Constitutio dogmatica de fide Catholica* proposed by the Vatican Council<sup>1</sup> the notion that what is intrinsic to faith can have any kind of foundation in the process of ratiocination which led up to it would appear to be excluded. We believe ". . . non propter intrinsecam rerum veritatem naturali rationis lumine perspectam, sed propter auctoritatem ipsius Dei revelantis . . ." The foundation of faith is thus "the authority of God revealing" and in no sense the evident truth of the mystery as perceived by reason. With the help of St. Thomas it may perhaps be possible to gain some further light on a question requiring not a little subtlety in its elucidation.

In the *Summa Theologica*<sup>2</sup> St. Thomas begins his discussion on faith by recalling the distinction between the object or thing which is known (*id quod materialiter cognoscitur*) and the point of view from which it is known (*id per quod cognoscitur, quod est formalis ratio objecti*)<sup>3</sup>. This principle of distinction is discernible in every branch of knowledge and is accordingly applicable to the virtue of faith which is essentially a form of knowledge, *habitus cognoscitivus*. When further it is realized that the "point of view" (*formalis ratio objecti*) determines all that is to be known about the "material object" (i.e. the actual thing or

<sup>1</sup> Denzinger, 1789.

<sup>2</sup> The translation of *formalis ratio objecti* (*medium cognitionis, ratio sub qua, lumen sub quo*) by the phrase "point of view" should not mislead by its suggestion of superficialness, of revealing but one among many aspects of the object known. It must be understood that the whole intelligibility of the object—or of the proposition signifying the object, as with faith—to the depths of its being derives from its *formalis ratio* or *medium cognitionis*, just as the quality of visibility depends totally upon light or colour.

<sup>3</sup> II-II, Q.1, art 1.

proposition which is known), the significance of its application in our present context will be at once apparent. Just as the faculty of sight lights upon nothing save in so far as it is illuminated or coloured (light or colour being the *formalis ratio* or *medium*), so faith contemplates everything as falling within its own specific point of view. As in every science its conclusions have only such force as is given to them by the premises through which they have been established (*media demonstrationis*), likewise with faith, we assent to its manifold propositions in virtue of their particular "medium". Now what is the all-important "medium" or "ratio formalis" of faith? Is it the antecedent reasoning processes which have led up to the act of faith being made? In no sense. The "medium" of faith is nothing less than First Truth, God as revealing himself: *in fide si consideremus formalem rationem objecti, nihil est aliud quam veritas prima: non enim fides de qua loquimur assentit alicui nisi quia est a Deo revelatum; unde ipsi veritati divinae fides innititur tamquam medio.*

It is this elevated conception of faith—based on Hebrews xi, 1<sup>1</sup> and subsequently to be enshrined in the Vatican definition—which underlies St. Thomas's whole theology and gives to it its incomparable assurance and power. Precisely by reason of its dependence on faith can theology be called with justice "*quaedam impressio divinae scientiae*",<sup>2</sup> that is, a certain impress upon the mind of the knowledge which God has of himself. In the article referred to, in which is discussed the definition of faith to be found in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is called "a habit of mind by which eternal life is begun in us": "*Fides est habitus mentis quo inchoatur vita aeterna in nobis.*" Nor is the striking realism and vitality of this notion of faith to be instanced by a few texts only; it is literally the first principle of the great theological system for which the Church has

<sup>1</sup> Cf. II-II. Q.4, art 1.

<sup>2</sup> I. Q.1, art 3, ad 2.

indicated her predilection. Not perhaps without significance, in a work written very near to the end of his life,<sup>1</sup> St. Thomas speaks of faith in what can fairly be described as lyrical terms ; it is "a certain fore-taste of that knowledge by which we shall be made happy in heaven", it is a "beatifying knowledge", it makes "the things that are hoped for" (Hebrews xi, 1), "that is, our future beatitude, to exist in us even now after a certain manner" : "*quasi jam in nobis per modum cuiusdam inchoationis subsistere faciens*". The intellectual content of faith is thus a prelude to the knowledge which will be ours in the Beatific Vision.

In the face of this teaching it becomes impossible to derive what is essential to faith from any external "evidence" perceptible to reason ; *fides est de non visis*. It is the nature of faith, strictly considered, to be without evidence, and it is manifest that no amount of "illuminating" or "vivifying" of the motives of credibility can raise them to the status required of the object which elicits faith. The rôle of evidence in the act of faith is replaced by "the authority of God revealing", *veritas prima in dicendo*. God, in the very act of proposing the (for us) mystery to be accepted, elicits, in virtue of his authoritative revelation, the faith required for its acceptance.<sup>2</sup> Thus the First Truth is simultaneously the primary object of faith and the means or "medium" by which that object is known : "*Veritas prima se habet in fide et ut medium et ut objectum.*"<sup>3</sup> In other words, faith brings with it its own assurance, transcending in certainty any security that reason could of itself provide. In the ultimate analysis God as revealing himself, First Truth, is both

<sup>1</sup> Compendium Theologiae, cap. II.

<sup>2</sup> To avoid undue complexity the part played by the Church as the divinely appointed authority for proposing to the world what has been originally revealed can, we think, be left undiscussed. The Church is the *regula fidei* to which adherence must be given if faith is to be complete, but the ultimate grounds of assent is *God as revealing* on which our belief in the Church itself is based.

<sup>3</sup> De Veritate, q. 14, art 8, ad 9.

the object of our belief and the motive or grounds on which we believe, somewhat as corporeal light is both the object which is seen and the medium by which it is seen : “. . . in quantum autem nihil nisi per lucem videri potest, lux ipsum visibile esse dicitur . . . et sic veritas prima est per se fidei objectum”.<sup>1</sup>

If then the motives of credibility, the *praeambula fidei*, contribute nothing to the essence of the act of faith but play only an accidental part, “*non per se sed per accidens ad fidem pertinent*”,<sup>2</sup> it still remains for us to determine what is their precise function. The same Council which explained so clearly the nature of faith was at equal pains to safeguard the truth that the Revelation which formed its object can be shown by the rational witness of history to have taken place.<sup>3</sup> By “manifest signs”, and in particular by miracles and prophecies, the mind can be led to the acceptance of each of the revealed truths as *believable* by divine faith. Indeed this must necessarily be so if the assent of faith is to escape the charge of being in conflict with reason. Nothing is willed unless it is first known ; and the will, even under the influence of grace, cannot demand of the intelligence the act of submission which faith implies until evidence be forthcoming of the credibility of the object of belief such that reason can approve. We must *know* that God has revealed himself before we can *believe* what his revelation contains. Nevertheless—and this is the whole point at issue—the act by which we assent to the fact of revelation differs essentially from the acceptance of its content by faith. It is not that the second is an intensification of the first ; for that would mean but an accidental development or modification of the original act of assent, whereas two quite different mental operations are in question. The actual specification of the act of intelligence after the infusion of faith is formally distinct from what it was on making

<sup>1</sup> Ib. ad 4.

<sup>2</sup> III Sent., d. 24, a. 2 ad 2 am quaest.

<sup>3</sup> Denzinger, 1790, 1812.

the judgement of credibility—by so much does “I believe” differ from “I ought to believe”.

It may now be possible to illustrate this extremely important point by reference to the mystery of Our Lord’s Personality. On the strength of historical evidence and the right use of reason it is possible to elicit the judgement of credibility (*iudicium credibilitatis*) in favour of the truth of his claims. To have listened to his teaching, to have witnessed, or received on trustworthy authority, the fact of the miracles, to have seen the verification of the prophecies, to be given proof of an incomparable holiness could not fail to establish in the mind a conviction of utter truthfulness and moral integrity. When all this is coupled with the unquestionable claim to an equality of nature with the Father, then the mind is morally bound to recognize the justice of that claim. We have not yet, however, arrived at faith, even though, as is likely, the movement towards the goal has so far been in co-operation with grace—but only at the ultimate rational predisposition to faith.

The mind has now given its assent to the truth of Christ’s divinity as far as it is capable of so doing, for its capacity here is limited. Drawing as it does all its data from the evidence of the senses—though capable of rising above sense evidence into the world of essences nevertheless verifying all its particular judgements by reference to the sensible world—the natural reason remains ill-at-ease when confronted by a reality so transcendently spiritual as God himself operating through a human nature. The evidence is within its limits compelling, but of its nature inadequate. Recalling once more the bearing of the point of view (*ratio formalis*) upon the facts to be considered (*id quod materialiter cognoscitur*), we may observe that the facts under consideration are the same as those with which faith has to do, viz., Christ himself and his works ; but, at this juncture, the all-determining “point of

view" is no more than the intelligibility of those facts as perceptible by reason—not their innate divine import, but their import such as can be grasped by defective human intelligence. And because the mind is here striving (supposing that it is so striving) to come to terms with a reality to which its powers are as yet in no way proportioned, it can fall back from the tremendous truth to seek an object for its contemplation better accommodated to its grasp. Thus, conceivably, the pharisees, confronted by Christ's miracles, were obliged to recognize the divinity of his mission and yet still withheld belief, being led by their perversity into the sin of infidelity. How often in our experience do we not find an acknowledgement of the Church's claims which, for reasons into which we need not inquire, has no issue in supernatural faith : "Oh yes, it all seems true enough ; nevertheless, I cannot believe" ?

Let us suppose, however, that the inquirer has responded with complete fidelity to the evidence, not only in admitting its truth, but—which is quite another matter—in adjusting his moral conduct to harmonize with it, and that, in accordance with the principle, *facienti quod in se est Deus non denegat gratiam*, he has received the gift of faith. What now is to be said of the mind of the believer in full possession of faith, assenting to the mystery we have been considering ? Be it noted that in actual fact, with the majority of the faithful, the individual motives of credibility, considered in themselves, are unequal to sustaining the revealed truth even in so far as it can be grasped by reason. The words of a father and mother were sufficiently authoritative to provide the rational antecedents to the acts of faith of a Teresa of Lisieux !—and of millions of the Church's children throughout the ages. But let the ideal case be assumed : the mind which, prior to the reception of faith, has been successively fortified by

motives of credibility sufficient of themselves to bring into consciousness the obligation to believe. The infusion of faith into an intelligence so informed produces within it a transformation no less complete than, because identical with, the change effected in the mind of the least instructed convert at the moment of final submission. It is not that there is given by grace a firmness of adhesion to the motives of credibility and an appreciation of their significance which did not exist before. The motives of credibility have no further part to play, save the quite subsidiary one of providing, where necessary, a subsequent defence of the act of faith against the charge of unreasonableness. To the act itself, supernatural not only in the way it comes about but of its very essence, they make no contribution. The intelligence has now been elevated to a point of view which is truly divine; it perceives, in the darkness of faith, the "night more lovely than the dawn", the mystery hidden from all ages in the mind of God and at length revealed by him.

That which, after the infusion of faith, objectifies the mental gaze and stands over against it as a vision to be contemplated, dark with excess of light, is, as we have seen with St. Thomas, nothing less than the uncreated Truth, *Veritas Prima*. The sublime reality of the Hypostatic Union is presented to the mind, no longer as something to be viewed from without in the wavering light of human reason, but in all its divine intelligibility and consequent mysteriousness (for us) as it is understood by God. By faith we adhere to the truth eternally present to the divine intelligence, not merely as a fact existing in the world of space and time as offered to the senses and capable of being apprehended by the natural intelligence: *unde oportet quod fides, quae virtus ponitur, faciat intellectum hominis adhaerere veritati quae in divina cognitione consistit transscendendo proprii intellectus veritatem.*<sup>1</sup> "Blessed art

---

<sup>1</sup> *De Veritate*, Q.14, art 8.

thou . . . because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven.”<sup>1</sup>

Nor must we be misled by the phrase, “the authority of God revealing”, as if it were some despotic act forcing the will to direct the intelligence blindly towards an object which stultifies it. The “authority” here is indistinguishable from the divine mind, First Truth, graciously presenting itself to the contemplation of creaturely intelligence, the mind which in its wisdom “reacheth from end to end mightily and ordereth all things sweetly”.<sup>2</sup> God revealing himself, *Veritas Prima in dicendo*, bears in upon the intellect at grips with the dogma proposed by the Church, in accurate though necessarily inadequate language, draws forth its assent and admits it to secret counsels prepared “before the foundation of the world”.<sup>3</sup> The mysteries remain—for as yet we see “as in a glass darkly”<sup>4</sup>—rejoicing the hearts of individual believers, offering to the Church inexhaustible riches of contemplation for her saints and vast fields of speculation for her theologians. For the Faith does not pause at the words in which its dogmas are pronounced but penetrates to the thing to which they relate: “*actus autem credentis non terminatur ad enuntiabile sed ad rem*”.<sup>5</sup> How significant must be a phrase such as this in relation to our belief in the personality of Christ! What the eyes of the disciples saw and what has filled the imagination of succeeding generations was truly the most gracious human figure the world has seen; but no more than that. By faith, and by faith only was contact made with the Word which “in the beginning . . . was with God”<sup>6</sup> and which gave to that incomparable humanity its unique personality.

Faith does not pass, as it were, from the particular *fact* proposed to our belief—e.g., apart from the Hypostatic Union, the Real Presence—upwards to

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xvi, 17.

<sup>2</sup> Wisdom viii, 1.

<sup>3</sup> Ephesians i, 4.

<sup>4</sup> I Corinthians xiii, 12.

<sup>5</sup> II-II. Q.1, art. 2, ad 2.

<sup>6</sup> John i, 1.

God ; it rather communicates in the first place directly with its divine source, God himself, and then comes downwards to observe the fact manifesting itself in the world of space and time. What was formerly seen on merely rational grounds to have been worthy of belief is now assented to as a revelation from on high. The motives of creditability are in no way strengthened—far from taking on a new significance, they may well have lost much of their appeal since the mind no longer rests upon them—but remain precisely what they were : adequate to the production of the judgement of credibility, but completely without efficacy for eliciting the act of faith, the “gift of God” *par excellence*.

Briefly and in summary :

(i) The mysteries of faith can be considered in two ways : from the point of view of reason, as to the evidence which they present for having been revealed by God—their *rational credibility* ; and from the point of view of faith, as believed on the authority of God revealing—their *supernatural credibility*. The first is the sphere of reason and historical research and is bounded at its highest point by the judgement “*I ought to believe*” ; the second is the realm of faith, of adherence to the truths proposed by the Church precisely as revealed by God himself, to which admittance is gained by the judgement “*I believe*”, whereby there is granted to the believer an earnest of the Beatific Vision.

(ii) The motives of credibility (*praeambula fidei*) do not enter into the essence of the act of faith ; they have a twofold function, (a) to induce in the mind the natural predispositions to faith, the assurance that the assent of faith is prudent and reasonable, (b) to provide principles whereby the Faith may be defended against those who impugn its rationality, i.e. to form the science of Apologetics.

(iii) Through supernatural faith we are given a knowledge different not only in degree but in kind from that engendered by the motives of credibility ; we are granted a share in God's own peculiar knowledge of the truths he has chosen to reveal.

By way of illustrating the practical importance of this doctrine it may perhaps be permissible to give two indications of the consequences which can follow from confusing together the judgement of credibility with the assent of belief, or, what amounts to the same thing, from identifying the motives of credibility with the motive of faith. They bear upon the two extremes of the *corpus doctrinae* in the exposition of which every priest—and *mutatis mutandis* every member of the Church—has his own part to play, that of Apologetics at the one extreme and Mystical Theology at the other.

A disregard of this all-important distinction in handling the truths of the Faith from an apologetic angle—i.e. as defending revealed truths against the attacks of unbelievers or as expounding the motives of credibility to those who believe—must lead either to a rationalizing of what is essentially above reason, an emptying from the Faith of its supernatural content, an attempt to *prove* what is beyond proof ; or else to the contrary error, that of surreptitiously reasoning from principles which presuppose faith, thereby committing the fallacy of *petitio principii* and implying that the motives of credibility are without the probative force which properly belongs to them.

The second and no less baneful result emerges in the spiritual direction to be given to contemplative souls ; it has been touched upon by one well qualified to discuss the point.<sup>1</sup> When contemplative prayer has become habitual and the chosen soul is being drawn into increasingly close union with God the

<sup>1</sup> Garrigou-Lagrange : *Perfection chrétienne et Contemplation*, tome II, p. 449 (1).

temptations then to be encountered are the most distressing of all : those against the theological virtue of faith ; and guidance will be sought from the director whose responsibility at this most critical juncture is very great. If he is unconsciously guilty of the confusion we have been attempting to elucidate he can scarcely fail to give wrong advice ; he will suggest the reading of some competent apologetic work wherein the particular difficulties experienced are dealt with, or will himself attempt by dint of argument to convince the penitent of the groundlessness of his (or her) fears. From the nature of the case advice along these lines must be misplaced, for he is now dealing with a soul which is being drawn into a union with God in faith and love to which rational arguments and the motives of credibility are powerless to give support. The counsel here to be given is surely to emphasize the importance of those acts of faith, so purifying and meritorious, whereby the soul clings directly to God, in darkness, but in greater security than it could derive from any evidences of reason.

It may well be that the second of these consequences is of rare occurrence, but the same cannot be said of the first—the blunder of the apologist with a defective theological equipment. It is revealed in the easy assertions of those who claim to *prove* the truth of the Faith, or who describe others and sometimes (in their folly) themselves as having “reasoned their way into the Church”. No names need be mentioned, but it seems possible that not everyone who comes forward to defend Catholic truth is aware of the difficulties of his task. The business is much more subtle and delicate than occasionally we might be led to suppose. The truths we believe are indeed supereminently reasonable—and, by that very fact, higher above reason than we can be aware of this side of the Beatific Vision.

AELRED GRAHAM, O.S.B.

## ST. ELEUTHERIUS AND THE CONVERSION OF BRITAIN

FOR two generations we have in England recited on the Second Sunday in the month a prayer for the Conversion of England in which we refer to St. Eleutherius, Celestine and Gregory as having delivered to us inviolate the faith of the holy Roman Church. Would it not be better to omit the name of Pope Eleutherius, since a number of Catholic authorities, even the Catholic Encyclopedia, look upon the story of Pope Eleutherius and King Lucius of Britain as a worthless legend? Why further the continuance of a myth which scientific history has completely exploded? Such thoughts may well come into a priest's mind when he reads the confident assertions of scholars, both Catholic and non-Catholic, who set the story aside almost with scorn. This present article is written in the endeavour to show that the story is not so improbable as it seems to some, and that one should not be overhasty in omitting the name of Pope St. Eleutherius from our public prayers.

Let us see how the case stands.

St. Bede, who was born in A.D. 673 and died in 735, and who, although an Anglo-Saxon, had ample opportunities to come in touch with British and Celtic Christians, tells us on two occasions: "Whilst Eleutherius, a holy man, presided over the Roman Church, Lucius, king of the Britons, sent a letter to him, entreating that by his command he might be made a Christian. He soon obtained his pious request, and the Britons preserved the faith, which they had received, uncorrupted and entire in peace and tranquillity until the time of the Emperor Diocletian" (*Eccles. Hist.*, I, 4). This he repeats in his chronology: "In the year from the Incarnation of our Lord 167, Eleutherius, being made bishop of Rome, governed the Church most gloriously 15 years.

Lucius, King of Britain, writing to him, requested to be made a Christian and succeeded in obtaining his request."

The direct source of these statements of St. Bede is the so-called *Liber Pontificalis*, which contains the following entry : "He [Eleutherius] received a letter from Lucius, a British king, that he might be made a Christian by his command." The close similarity in the actual wording makes it certain that St. Bede had read this entry. The *Liber Pontificalis* is a series of short biographies of the Popes, arranged in chronological order and composed shortly after A.D. 514 and continued till 530. From the years A.D. 496 to 530 the author was probably a witness of the facts he relates. He must have been some minor ecclesiastical official at Rome with a turn for archaeology and history. Some of his sources are known and can be traced a couple of centuries back, but some of his sources we cannot trace. The source of this reference to King Lucius is one of them. The author is not otherwise interested in the missionary enterprise of Rome, and the spread of Christianity in far-away regions ; the item is, therefore, somewhat unique. It was used not only by St. Bede, who was an Anglo-Saxon, but also by Nennius, who was a native Briton, a disciple of Elbod, bishop of Bangor, through whom the Roman Easter was introduced into Wales about A.D. 770. Later Welsh history claims to know the details of this Papal mission to Lucius and the names of the messengers.

Modern scholars maintain that this story about Eleutherius cannot be true, since there were no British kings in Roman Britain about that time, and that any embassy of a British chieftain to Rome is in itself most improbable. Moreover, they point out that Gildas, a native British historian, who was born about A.D. 500, that is 173 years before St. Bede, does not mention it. Lastly, that the matter can easily be

explained by a mistake of the author of the *Liber Pontificalis*, who mistook Britio, a term for the capital of Osroene, for Britain in the west.

The objections seem formidable, but are they really unanswerable? Are they sufficient to relegate the story, that Pope Eleutherius sent us the faith, to the realm of worthless legends?

Let the reader judge.

The first objection of the antecedent improbability of their being a "king" of the Britons in the years concerned seems the weakest. The word "king" has a grandiose sound, but it need mean no more than "kinglet", or chieftain. The medieval majesty attached to the Latin word *rex* is of later growth. The tetrarch of Galilee, a dependent ruler of a territory not much larger than an English county, is styled "king". The Gospel of St. John speaks of a "regulus, cuius filius infirmabatur Capharnaum". There it means only functionary, or man at court, or prince, rendering the Greek: *basilikos*. We know too little of the detailed history of Britain at that time to dismiss airily the existence of such a native prince or chieftain in this country. There were certainly parts of the country inaccessible to the Romans. The Romans were in full and direct control of all the east of England, but in the west they held strategical points such as Caerleon and Chester, but how far they held control in the fastnesses of Wales, whether they did this through local chieftains or through Roman officials it would be hard to say. There is no more unlikelihood in one such chieftain in Britain sending to Rome to be made a Christian than in Abgar IX the kinglet of Edessa doing so. The famous tombstone of Abercius of Hierapolis, who was a contemporary of Pope Eleutherius, shows us that Christians all over the world regarded Rome as the centre of Christendom, for there we read that Christ "taught him the word of life and sent him to Rome to see the kingdom and the

Queen, golden clad and golden shod, and that he saw there the people, having the lightsome seal". A British chieftain coming in contact with Christianity through Christians in the Roman legions, but finding but little, if any, ecclesiastically ordered Christendom in his neighbourhood, may well have sent to the head of Christendom in Rome, especially if he intended to bring his people and tribe with him into the Christian Church. The *a priori* dismissal of the story is, therefore, singularly unjustified.

On the contrary, reliable history points to the fact that precisely in the reign of Pope Eleutherius there was a remarkable conversion of Britons to Christianity.

St. Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons soon after A.D. 177, had occasion, in his great work *Adversus Haereses*, to refer to the wonder of the wide diffusion of Christianity throughout the world. He mentions Germany, Spain and France, or to use his terms : the Germanies, the Iberians, and the Celts, and by Celts he understands the Gauls in the district of Lyons. He does not mention the Britons (*Adv. Haer.*, I, 3). The Celts were, of course, well known to the Saint. He excuses his not very elegant Greek by saying that he lives amongst them and spends his time mostly in talking their barbarian language. Now this reference to Germany, Spain and France occurs in the first book of his great work. In the third book he mentions St. Eleutherius as the reigning Pontiff. Hence the passage in question must have been written before A.D. 189, when St. Eleutherius died, and it may have been written several years before that date, since that work was certainly not written straight off the reel. The passage occurs right at the opening of the work, which may have taken years to complete. We take it that, when St. Irenaeus wrote that passage, there were no "constituted churches" (the Greek has "ecclesiae hidrumenai") outside Germany, Spain and France, otherwise he would have certainly included

Britain in his enumeration. Either, therefore, St. Eleutherius, who "reigned gloriously fifteen years", had not yet sent missionaries, or if he had, not sufficient time had elapsed to speak of ecclesiae hidrumenai: "constituted churches".

Now let us turn to Tertullian, who wrote roughly some twenty to twenty-five years later in a controversial work (*Adv. Jud.*, ch. viii): "Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita . . . in quibus omnibus locis Christi nomen jam venit and regnat ute pote in omnibus locis populus nominis Christi inhabitet." Evidently Christ has "come and reigned" in Britain since St. Irenaeus wrote. It is not a question of some Christians in the Roman legions stationed there, it is a question of the native populace of Britain, and these people amongst whom Christ reigns live in places as yet inaccessible to the Romans. In the year A.D. 200 Tertullian's expression would naturally refer to Wales, which was the only considerable district permanently inaccessible to the Romans.<sup>1</sup> Now let us go from Carthage in the west to Alexandria in the east. Origen writes some forty years later and thrice mentions the evangelization of Britain. "For when did the country of Britain before the coming of Christ consent to the religion of One God? But now, on account of the churches that occupy the very frontiers of the world, the whole of it [the country of Britain] cries with joy to the Lord of Israel." "The Power of the Lord Saviour is also with those who are separated from our world in Britain and with all those who, under the sun, believe in his name." "What shall we say about the Britons and Germans, who live near the Ocean, or amongst the barbarians, the Dacians, Sarmatians and Scythians, of whom many have not yet heard the word of

<sup>1</sup> During the rebellion under Septimius Severus (A.D. 193-211) no doubt large tracts were temporarily in the hands of local chieftains in opposition to Rome.

the Gospel?" (Homil. 4 in *Ezech.*, 6 in *Luc.*, in *Mat.* 39).

The comparison of these texts with the silence of St. Irenaeus shows that there must have been a remarkable movement towards mass conversions in Britain towards the latter part of the second century and the most natural cause of these would be the conversion of a local British chieftain. Nothing makes it unlikely that this happened during the fifteen years of Pope Eleutherius' reign.

The strongest objection of all is usually drawn from the silence of Gildas, the earliest British historian. What, then, does Gildas say of the conversion of Britain? It is but one single involved sentence, nothing more: "Christus, vere sol tempore, ut scimus, summo Tiberii Caesaris (quo absque ullo impedimento ejus propagabatur religio; comminata, senatu nolente, a principe morte delatoribus militum ejusdem) radios suos primum indulget." In Britain the land of mist and glacial cold, "Christ the true Sun first granted His rays in the last years of Tiberius Caesar, as we know. Since that time Christ's religion was propagated without any hindrance, for the Prince, against the will of the Senate, had threatened death against those who informed against his soldiers."

Now it seems obvious that the name Tiberius is somehow a mistake, for Tiberius died in the year A.D. 37, within half a dozen years of Christ's Resurrection. Gildas cannot but have heard of the persecutions of Nero, Domitian, and Decius, and cannot have meant, therefore, that Christ's religion was propagated within a few years of the Resurrection without any hindrance in Britain. He would have written simply: We know that Christ's religion was never persecuted in England at all till Diocletian. Moreover, the sentence comes in his narrative after an account of British risings against the Romans which happened long after the reign of Tiberius. Again, he writes that

it was in the last years of the Emperor, as we know, i.e. "summo tempore, ut scimus". If Tiberius were really meant, this would be a quaintly redundant expression. Even the Gospels tell us that St. John the Baptist began to preach in the fifteenth year of Tiberius. Our Lord, therefore, could not have died before the Emperor's eighteenth year and any imperial permission to preach Christianity and death penalty against informers on Christian soldiers must have been years after. In fact, the whole thing is absurd.

But, as a matter of fact, there is a Roman Emperor who did forbid, under death penalty, false information against Christian soldiers, and that Emperor reigned during the rule of Pope Eleutherius, and that Emperor would naturally be designated as "M. Verus". Surely "Tiberi" is a mistake for "M. Veri". The letter B is constantly interchanged for V, as the two letters sounded practically the same, as they do today in Spanish in which "Bino" constantly stands for "Vino", as in the Catacombs "Bibas" sometimes stands for "Vivas". If then we read "Mberi" or "M. Veri" instead of "Tiberi", Gildas, so far from giving rise to an objection, is a strong confirmation of the Eleutherius-Lucius story.

Here we must give some attention to the famous Rain-wonder under Marcus Aurelius. It amazed the whole Roman world. Any priest who has studied in Rome has, of course, seen a sculptural representation of it on the column of Marcus Aurelius, who wrote to the Senate about it. Pagans had, in official documents, obviously to ascribe it to their Pagan gods, to Jupiter Pluvius.

Official coins were struck in commemoration of the event. The Roman Army fighting in Bohemia against Germans and Czechs was in dire straits of thirst, having had nothing to drink for many days while beset by barbarian hordes. A sudden rain-storm, in answer to prayer, brought salvation.

Lightning drove the enemy to flight and destruction, but a shower refreshed the Roman Army and secured its victory. Claudius Apollinaris, writing only six years later his Open Letter to the Emperor, ascribes the event to the prayers of one of the Roman legions, consisting of Christians, and says that the Emperor confirmed its title of Legio Fulminata. Tertullian, writing somewhat later, says that in consequence the Emperor forbade informers to denounce Christians. These are his words : "We [Christians] can show you a protector, if the letters of the honoured emperor, M. Aurelius, be searched, in which he testifies that the famous drought in Germany was put a stop to by the rain which fell in answer to the prayers of the Christians who happened to be in his army. Thus, although he did not openly abolish punishment incurred by such men, yet in another way he openly neutralized it, adding also a condemnation and, indeed, a more shocking one, for their accusers."

Tertullian's reference to a more shocking condemnation ("damnatione et quidem tetriore") shows that he was acquainted with Marcus Aurelius' letter, or supposed letter, to the Senate, in which letter informers against Christians are to be burnt alive if the Christian accused is guilty of no crime. Now Gildas, by his reference to soldiers ("militum") shows that he has not Tiberius but Marcus Aurelius in mind, whose edict of toleration is connected with soldiery who, by their prayers, had obtained a signal rescue of the Roman army from death by thirst. This was, no doubt, what really happened.<sup>1</sup> Marcus Aurelius was certainly an enemy of Christianity and fierce persecution took place during his reign, but he was also a good army-man. One division of his army, the legion from Melitene, was predominantly Christian. When surrounded in the Sudeten mountains by an over-

<sup>1</sup> This point has been excellently dealt with by A. D. Clarke in the *Catholic Gazette*, Oct. 1925, pp. 261 fol.

whelming multitude of barbarians, and while in direst extremity for hunger, but especially thirst, the bulk of this legion had thrown itself on its knees and implored the God of the Christians. A terrific storm discomfiting the barbarians and supplying the Roman soldiers with water was the answer. This amazed the pagan soldiers beyond words. In the first flush of victory, with some sense of gratitude and also as a matter of shrewd policy, the Emperor put a stop to the low game of informers against Christians in the army. In far-away Britain, where Roman law and influence was more enshrined in and limited by the army of occupation, this brought peace to local Christianity there for some 120 years, till Diocletian's determined effort to crush Christianity everywhere, and even then Constantius Chlorus, the Caesar ruling in Britain, applied the edicts as mildly as he dared.

If it be asked why Gildas should write "M. Veri" for "M. Aurelii", it must be remembered that Verus was the final name of that Emperor. Marcus Aurelius was rather his popular designation. His full name was Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Verus. Eusebius, the historian, normally calls him by his name Verus.<sup>1</sup>

Supposing even that we do not admit the scribal error of "Tiberi" for "M. Veri", we leave still the possibility that Gildas wrote Tiberius instead of Marcus Aurelius, because he had confusedly in his mind the story mentioned by Tertullian and Eusebius about that Emperor wishing to put Christ amongst the officially admitted deities, but the Senate refusing to do so on the plea that the matter had not been sufficiently considered.

Be that as it may, the reputed silence of Gildas is not the insurmountable difficulty it is said to be.

But how did the author of the *Liber Pontificalis* get

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps St. Bede read Gildas and understood him in our sense. Is it chance that both follow up their reference to Christian origins immediately by stating how the Britons held the faith till Diocletian?

to know this peculiar historical item concerning the conversion of far-away Britain? We cannot say definitely and in detail, but we can say that he must have had easy access to information regarding the origins of Christianity amongst the Britons. After the withdrawal of the Roman legions from Britain, the Britons, under pressure of Picts and Scots, emigrated in great numbers to France into what is now Britanny. During the last times of the Roman domination in Gaul, Britons appear among the defenders of the Empire. A company of Britons, commanded by the king Riothime, was beaten by Euric, king of the Visigoths, in the very heart of France. They turned to Burgundy and somehow disappear from history. These Britons were Christians, had special bishops of whom two are known, Mansuetus at the Council of Tours A.D. 461, and Revocatus the friend of Faustus of Riez in Provence, a Briton from Great Britain, and Sidonius Apollinaris. Pope Celestine I (A.D. 423-431) sent Palladius to Northern Britain, Pope Leo I (440-461) confirmed St. Patrick in the See of Armagh in A.D. 444. St. Germanus of Auxerre, whose fame was in all Christendom, twice made prolonged visits to Britain. St. Ninian, a North Briton of royal descent, lived in Rome for a time, and died in 432 as missionary in Cumberland and Scotland.

The origin of Christianity in Britain cannot have been so difficult to ascertain in Rome. Pelagius, a British monk in Rome, who died after A.D. 418, became notorious throughout the Christian world as founder of a heresy. The habits of Britishers were certainly not unknown in Rome, for St. Jerome refers to their liking for porridge! There must have been a considerable number of them in that city, if their diet became the object of a jibe! There is, therefore, nothing incredible in that the beginnings of their Christianity could be ascertained in Rome.

Nor should it be forgotten that the Eleutherius story found ready acceptance in Wales itself. Owing to the bitter enmity between the Welsh and the Saxons it is not likely they learnt and accepted the story from St. Bede, and their national pride would surely rather have led them to stories about Glastonbury, St. Joseph of Arimathea, and St. Paul visiting Britain.

We come lastly to Adolf Harnack's interesting suggestion that the Lucius, king of Britain, is no one else than Abgar IX, king of Edessa, who assumed the Latin name of Lucius and who became a Christian about the time of Pope Eleutherius, and even visited Rome in person. What is the ground of this suggestion? There exists a brief list of places of burial of the Twelve Apostles. The date of this list is certainly ancient, but not precisely determinable. In this it is stated that two are buried "in Britio Edessemorum". This Britio is taken to be the castle or fortress of the city of Edessa in Mesopotamia. No doubt a latinization of the Semitic word "Birtha". The author of the *Liber Pontificalis* mistook Britio for Britain! Well, it may be so. The suggestion is ingenious. But there is much against it. After all, one does not call a king after a castle in his capital. To take a similar case: we do not call our sovereigns kings of Buckingham Palace, or kings of Windsor. "Lucius king of Britio" is an expression in the highest degree improbable. He belonged to an ancient dynasty. He was already the ninth Abgar. His country was styled Osrhoene by the Romans, his capital Edessa in Greek and Latin, and Urhoi in his native tongue; why Lucius of Britio? It is as if one said in a modern book, Louis XIV of the Tuilleries, or of Versailles. Note also that in the list of Apostolic burial places Britio is specified by *Edessenum*, the Britio of the Edessenes, as if such specification were necessary, otherwise it might be any birtha or britio. How could the *Liber Pontificalis* mistake Britio

for Britain if it was followed by the well-known name of Edessa? Moreover, Lucius Abgar IX came to Rome in person in A.D. 202 and was honourably received by the Emperor Severus. This fact is more noteworthy than a mere sending to Rome which is said of Lucius of Britain. If Lucius of Britain were really the Eastern Potentate of Edessa, why is not rather his visit to the Holy City mentioned?

One might, lastly, insist on the remarkable identity of the name Lucius in both cases. The value of this identity must be admitted. On the other hand, the name of Lucius was not rare. The name of the co-regnant Roman Emperor was Lucius Verus, and native princes adopted such names as compliments to their Suzerains. The full name of Abgar was: Lucius Aelius Septimius Megas Abgarus IX. The name Abgar was well-known in Christian writings; Eusebius uses it in telling of the legend of Abgar Ukama and Our Lord. As far as I know Abgar IX never occurs under the mere designation of "Lucius", and Lucius, king of Britio, seems in the highest degree unlikely.

The reader can now judge for himself whether he would advise the hierarchy to order the omission of the name Eleutherius from the well-known public prayer. The author thinks that one should not be overhasty.

J. ARENDZEN.

## NEWMAN : THE PREACHER

OF all his pulpit utterances Newman looked on his University sermons as containing, at least in seed, some of his most valuable work. These sermons were intended to furnish, in defence of the Christian Faith, an apologetic that would help it to meet and overcome the special dangers by which, at the hands of Modern Science, it found itself confronted. These memorable discourses were addressed to men of learning, to professed theologians, to those familiar with the language of the schools. They were concerned with the relations between Faith and Reason, a subject to which he was to return in his Catholic days, when the burden of the years was heavy upon him, in a volume devoted to the philosophy of faith entitled : *An Essay in aid of a Grammar of Assent*.

In 1871, many decades after their first delivery, these sermons were gathered together in a volume dedicated to his friend Richard William Church, then Dean of St. Paul's : "You were," said Newman in a dedicatory epistle of singular grace and charm, "one of those dear friends resident in Oxford . . . who in those trying five years, from 1841 to 1845 . . . did so much to comfort and uphold me by their patient, tender kindness, and their zealous services in my behalf. I cannot forget (he continues) how, in the February of 1841, you suffered me day after day to open to you my anxieties and plans, as events successively elicited them ; and much less can I lose the memory of your great act of friendship, as well as of justice and courage, in the February of 1845, your Proctor's year, when you, with another now departed, shielded me from the "civium ardor prava jubentium" by the interposition of a prerogative belonging to your academical position. But much as I felt your generous conduct towards me at the time, those very circum-

stances which gave occasion to it deprived me then of the power of acknowledging it."

By 1871, however, time had removed all these hindrances and he thus concludes his letter : "Accept then, my dear Church, though it be late, this expression of my gratitude, now that the lapse of years, the judgment passed on me by (what may be called) posterity, and the dignity of your present position, encourage me to think that, in thus gratifying myself, I am not inconsiderate towards you."

In his delightful volume, *Newman and His Friends*, Father Henry Tristram of the Birmingham Oratory makes the following interesting comment in explanation of Church's intervention as Proctor : "In the dedication," says Father Tristram, "Newman speaks of 'those trying five years from 1841 to 1845'. In the *Apologia* he uses a more vivid phrase : 'From the end of 1841, I was on my death-bed, as regards my membership with the Anglican Church.' It was Church (continues Father Tristram) who, more than Charles Cornish, more than Charles Marriott, more even than any other man, stood beside that death-bed, and helped Newman through the dark night of the soul. Mark Pattison has left it on record that he did not rate very highly Newman's intimates. Certainly they were not on a level with Pattison himself. But then it is open to question whether any other man who came under the influence of the Movement, whatever his ultimate destination, was in sheer intellectual power Pattison's equal. However, the names of those who most frequented Littlemore produce the conviction that Newman must have felt the society of a man of Church's calibre to be, not only a relief from the flats of humdrum conversation, but a bracing intellectual tonic. These years of patient, faithful, loyal devotion reached their consummation in Church's action on 13 February, 1845. On that day a formal censure of the principles of Tract 90 was

proposed in Convocation ; but it never came to the vote. 'The senior Proctor, Mr. Guillemand of Trinity, stopped it in the words, *Nobis procuratoribus non placet.*' Thus summarily Church dismisses the incident. But he does not say that he himself was the junior Proctor, nor that, having suggested the interposition of the proctorial veto, he had much ado to sustain his colleague's resolution. After what was to him the tragic event of 9 October, 1845, he continued to walk out to Littlemore occasionally, and on 22 February, 1846, he was one of the 'various friends' who went to say good-bye at the Observatory."

These sermons, as we have said, are intended for the erudite. They contain unrivalled examples of Newman's delicacy of insight and expression. But, though they will always remain valuable as contributions to the philosophy of religion, it was not by them, or at least not chiefly by them, that Newman exerted on the Oxford of his day that profound and heart-searching influence which, despite the manifold changes which time has wrought in the world, and not least in Oxford itself, still lingers on there with the fragrance of a half-remembered dream—not by them, but by the sermons preached at St. Mary's in the afternoon to his ordinary parishioners, *Parochial and Plain Sermons* he calls them. Eloquent pens have not been wanting to describe the power of his words and the almost unearthly sweetness of his voice, a voice so pure and so beautiful that those who were privileged to hear it in their youth bore the remembrance of it in their hearts to their dying day. "We felt," says one of his disciples, "that his words were the words of a seer who saw God." "Happy," says Matthew Arnold, speaking of that "religious music, subtle, sweet, and mournful"—"happy are they who, in the susceptible period of youth, hear such voices ; they are a possession to them forever."

So truly did he read the hearts of his listeners, so

accurately did he divine their troubles, discerning their weaknesses and giving utterance to their longings, that he seemed to be speaking to each one individually and, as it were, calling him by name. No magnificent unfolding of imposing generalities, no grandiloquent exposition of doctrine, no resounding eloquence, no dazzling display of rhetoric, marked these sermons ; but a simplicity that was almost austere, and a pleading more persuasive than the forensic splendours of the most accomplished rhetorician. The language which, at a first glance, might seem plain to the point of baldness, reveals, on a closer scrutiny, a classic grace, a subtle charm which steals by "like music on the waters". The memory of that voice for those who once had fallen beneath its spell never faded. In Oxford halls it long remained, indeed it still remains, a legend. Thirty years after he had taken what he had deemed his last leave of his University, he was elected an Honorary Fellow of his old undergraduate college, Trinity, and, as the guest of that Society dined at the High Table in his academic dress. Lord Bryce—Mr. Bryce he then was—recalling this memorable event, dwells on the pathos of it, speaking of "the old man revisiting after so many eventful years the hall where he had been wont to sit as a youth, the voice so often heard in St. Mary's retaining, faint though it had grown, the sweet modulations Oxford knew so well". "It was," says one who had heard him in those unforgettable days, when men learnt that in Oxford that voice would be heard no more—"it was as when, to one kneeling by night in some vast Cathedral, the great bell tolling solemnly overhead had suddenly gone still. Since then," he adds, of those for whom that music was henceforth silent, "many voices of powerful teachers they may have heard, but none that ever penetrated the soul like his."

It is improbable that many people, unless they

happen, for one reason or another, to be specially concerned with Newman, as students of literature or of religious history, now read his sermons as a whole. It is a pity, because, apart from their spiritual value, which time has not diminished, they are precious, and will always so remain, as models of choice and distinguished English.

There was nothing histrionic about his preaching. The artifices to which pulpit orators too often have recourse to stir the emotions of their audience, were not for him. The stately periods, the sonorous eloquence of a Bossuet or a Massillon were equally foreign to his manner. Comparing Bossuet and Fénelon, the Abbé Huvelin says, "Bossuet, c'est la grandeur biblique, il fait sentir la puissance de Dieu devant lequel toute créature s'incline. Fénelon a quelque chose de plus humain, il cherche la fibre humaine. L'un procède par autorité, l'autre par persuasion. Bossuet pose et développe trois ou quatre arguments théologiques : Fénelon s'adresse à l'âme, il cherche en toute chose ce qui la persuadera, ce qui sera en harmonie avec elle."

So also it may be said of Newman. He, too, sought the "fibre humaine", sought to touch and make vibrate the heart-strings of his hearers. I have heard that he stood very still when preaching, that he would utter one or two sentences rapidly, and then pause. He seemed as one listening to a voice, and beholding a vision inaudible and invisible to other ears and eyes. At times there stole into his speech a strange mystic quality that imparts to his words an almost sacramental power ; as here for example :

"At times we seem to catch a glimpse of a Form which we shall hereafter see face to face. We approach, and, in spite of the darkness, our hands, or our head, or our brow, or our lips become, as it were, sensible to the contact of something more than earthly. We know not where we are, but we have been bathing in water and a voice tells us that it is

blood. Or we have a mark signed upon our foreheads and it spake of Calvary. Or we recollect a hand laid upon our heads, and surely it had the print of the nails in it and resembled His Who with a touch gave sight to the blind and raised the dead. Or we have been eating and drinking; and it was not a dream surely, that One fed us from His wounded side and renewed our nature by the heavenly meat He gave."

Two, at least, of Newman's sermons have passed, so to speak, into the *corpus* of our literature. As the *Apologia* and the *Idea of a University* have taken their place among the great prose masterpieces of our language, appealing to all English-speaking people, no matter what their creed, so two of Newman's sermons, one belonging to his Anglican, the other to his Catholic days, will never fall into oblivion.

It was in 1839 that doubts first began to assail Newman's mind regarding the Anglican position, doubts arising from his investigations into the Monophysite and Donatist heresies. But, in addition to these inward misgivings, his faith in Anglicanism was rudely assailed from without. In Tract 90, he had set himself the task of giving a Catholic interpretation to the Thirty-nine articles, only to find his efforts greeted with a storm of indignant protest. The Anglican bishops condemned him. The Heads of Houses followed suit. Deans altered the dinner-hour in their several colleges, so that, if men wanted to hear Newman preach, they would have to do so on an empty stomach; though one of these draconian Deans himself chose the sermons.

And so he who had borne so conspicuous a part in denouncing "the errors and corruptions of Rome", was beginning to entertain grave doubts regarding the stability of his own position. His confidence began to falter. He had led his disciples on thus far in high hopes and in perfect good faith. But now, suddenly, the way began to grow strange. A greyness

fell upon the path which hitherto had seemed to be so full of promise. His Theoretic Church, the *Via Media*, the outcome of "a sort of remodelled and adapted Antiquity" had melted into thin air. It was like the transformation that we read of in fairy-tales when the magic castle disappears "and nothing is seen but the wild heath, the barren rock and the forlorn sheep-walk".

When the storm broke, Newman, in order to possess his soul in peace, and realizing that his work as leader of the Movement was over, withdrew to Littlemore, and it was there that he preached, two long years before his conversion, his last sermon as an Anglican, the sermon which was afterwards given to the world under the title of "The Parting of Friends", the sermon in which he uttered the words of final leave-taking to those, his loyal and loving followers, who so long had hung upon his lips, but who, henceforth, would hear this voice no more.

Long, long he had striven, he and his comrades, to bring back to the poor, distracted Church of England something of the vanished radiance, the forgotten sanctity of the far-off Christian dawn, something of the rich and ancient heritage of Catholic tradition—bright hopes doomed to wither and decay.

"O thou, from whom surrounding nations lit their lamps ! O Virgin of Israel !" he exclaimed of the Church of his baptism, "Wherefore dost thou now sit on the ground and keep silence, like one of the foolish women who were without oil on the coming of the Bridegroom ? Where is now the ruler of Sion, and the doctor in the Temple, and the ascetic on Carmel, and the herald in the wilderness and the preacher in the market-place ? Where are Thy 'effectual fervent prayers' offered in secret, and thy alms and good works coming up as a memorial before God ? How is it, O once holy place, that 'the land mourneth, for the corn is wasted, the new wine is dried up, the oil languisheth . . . because joy is withered away from the sons of

men ?' 'Alas for the day ! . . . how do the beasts groan ! The herds of cattle are perplexed, because they have no pasture, the flocks of sheep are made desolate'. 'Lebanon is ashamed and hewn down ; Sharon is like a wilderness, and Bashan and Carmel shake off their fruits.' "

And then, breaking out into a cry of passionate sorrow, he went on :

"O my mother, whence is this unto thee, that thou hast good things poured upon thee and canst not keep them, and bearest children, yet darest not own them ? Why hast thou not the skill to use their services, nor the heart to rejoice in their love ? How is it that whatever is generous in purpose, and tender or deep in devotion, thy flower and thy promise, falls from thy bosom and finds no home within thine arms ? Who hath put this note upon thee, to have 'a miscarrying womb, and dry breasts', to be strange to thine own flesh, and thine eye cruel towards thy little ones ? Thine own offspring, the fruit of thy womb, who love thee and would toil for thee, thou dost gaze upon with fear, as though a portent, or thou dost loathe as an offence—at best thou dost but endure, as if they had no claim but on thy patience, self-possession, and vigilance, to be rid of them as easily as thou mayest. Thou makest them 'stand all the day idle', as the very condition of thy bearing with them ; or thou biddest them to be gone, where they will be more welcome ; or thou sellest them for nought to the stranger that passes by. And what wilt thou do in the end thereof? . . .

And now the most poignant moment of all has come, the moment of leave-taking. His voice faltered and many of those who heard him could not restrain their tears.

"O my brethren," he said, as he gazed down upon them from the pulpit from which he had spoken to them so often, "O kind and affectionate hearts, O loving friends, should you know any one whose lot it has been, by writing or by word of mouth, in some degree to help you thus to act ; if he has ever told you what you knew about yourselves, or

what you did not know ; has read to you your wants or feelings, and comforted you by the very reading ; has made you feel that there was a higher life than this daily one, and a brighter world than that you see ; or encouraged you, or soothed you, or opened a way to the inquiring, or soothed the perplexed ; if what he has said or done has ever made you take interest in him, and feel well inclined towards him ; remember such a one in time to come, though you hear him not, and pray for him, that in all things he may know God's will, and at all times he may be ready to fulfil it."

In 1852, the Catholic Hierarchy was re-established in England. The outburst that was created by this event has passed into history, and we need not refer to it here, except to say that it was of almost unprecedented violence. Gradually the storm subsided, but it left behind it one memorial that will not pass away. The crowd of disputants at last withdrew ; on the splutter of all that "hot rhetoric" silence fell. And then, amid the stillness, was heard the sound of a voice, lovely and forlorn, a voice apart and solitary, a voice that cannot die.

There are surely few things in the whole range of English literature as beautiful as the opening — slow and stately, like the prelude of some majestic symphony — of the famous sermon preached by Newman at St. Mary's, Oscott, in commemoration of the re-establishment of the Hierarchy and entitled "The Second Spring".

"We have familiar experience [it begins] of the order, the constancy, the perpetual renovation of the material world which surrounds us. Frail and transitory as is every part of it, restless and migratory as are its elements, never-ceasing as are its changes, still it abides. It is bound together by a law of permanence, it is set up in unity ; and, though it is ever dying, it is ever coming to life again. Dissolution does but give birth to fresh modes of organization, and one death is the parent of a thousand lives. Each hour, as it comes, is but a testimony, how fleeting, yet how secure, how certain, is

the great whole. It is like an image on the waters, which is ever the same, though the waters ever flow. Change upon change—yet one change cries out to another, like the alternate Seraphim, in praise and in glory of their Maker. The sun sinks to rise again ; the day is swallowed up in the gloom of the night, to be born out of it, as fresh as if it had never been quenched. Spring passes into summer, and through summer and autumn into winter, only the more surely, by its own ultimate return, to triumph over that grave, towards which it resolutely hastened from its first hour."

Then he proceeds to contrast the material world, so vigorous, so reproductive amid all its changes, with the moral world, so feeble, so downward, so resourceless, amid all its aspirations. "That which ought to come to nought, endures ; that which promises a future, disappoints and is no more. . . . Man rises to fall : he tends to dissolution from the moment he begins to be . . . He is . . . as a bubble that breaks, and as water poured out upon the earth. He was young, he is old, he is never young again. This is the lament over him poured forth in verse and in prose, by Christian and by heathen. . . . Powers of the world, sovereignties, dynasties, sooner or later come to nought ; they have their fatal hour. . . . Thus man and his works are mortal ; they die, and they have no power of renovation."

But the unprecedented, the impossible *had* happened. A miracle had been wrought. "The past *has* returned," he cried. "The dead lives. Thrones are overturned, and are never restored ; States live and die, and then are matter only for history. Babylon was great, and Tyre, and Egypt, and Niniveh, and shall never be great again. The English Church was, and the English Church was not, and the English Church is once again. This is the portent, worthy of a cry." And he breaks forth in a passage of passionate lyrical beauty as he describes how the Catholic Church,

which had long been dead, had been born anew in this English land :

"Arise, Jerusalem, for thy light is come, and the Glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. . . . Arise, make haste, my love, my dove, my beautiful one and come. For the winter is now past, and the rain is over and gone. The flowers have appeared in our land. . . . O Mary, my hope, O Mother undefiled, fulfil to us the promise of this Spring. A second temple rises on the ruins of the old. Canterbury has gone its way, and York is gone, and Durham is gone, and Winchester is gone . . . but the Church in England has died, and the Church lives again. Westminster and Nottingham, Beverley and Hexham, Northampton and Shrewsbury, if the world lasts, shall be names as musical to the ear, as stirring to the heart, as the glories we have lost ; and Saints shall rise out of them, if God so will, and Doctors once again shall give the law to Israel, and Preachers call to penance and to justice, as at the beginning."

These words echoed (they echo still) not alone in the ears of those to whom they were primarily addressed. Not an Anglican but his heart was stirred and kindled by the music of them. Macaulay, it is said, knew the sermon by heart.

A French critic, M. Floris Delattre, discerns a difference between the Anglican and the Catholic sermons. "Newman's Catholic sermons," he says, "are very different from those which he preached at St. Mary's, Oxford. The somewhat cold reserve, the sober delicacy of the Anglican sermons, have given place to a fervour which, though doubtless very sincere, does not disdain the adornment of a copious and sonorous rhetoric. One somehow feels that Newman, still not quite at home with Catholic theology and devotional practices, is inclined to force his talent a little, and that the energy of his new ardour of devotion has been purchased at the price of the

exquisite *nuances* of his utterances of an earlier day."

Whether there be any general grounds for that criticism or not, it is quite certain that the later Newman can be sober and quiet enough when the subject demands it. The volume which contains the famous "Second Spring", contains at least two other examples in which the *nuances* are every whit as delicate as in any sermon of his Oxford days: "The Tree Beside the Waters" and "In the World but not of the World". His vocabulary was, to quote the words of the late Canon William Barry, made up of "the natural, yet not commonplace terms of the current language". "He never," says the same writer, "could be quaint, odd, or affected; he went up to the heights as by steps that were visible to all".

It has been Cardinal Newman's singular achievement to produce a style that is at once simple and distinguished, a style that is, as Matthew Arnold used to say "of the centre", and most unmistakably individual. But, after all, a man's style, as Newman himself declares, "is his shadow", and these qualities which we praise so highly in his speech and writings—simplicity, grace, harmony, ineffable distinction are but the veil, the outward garment, that clothes, and lends form and outline, to the viewless and inapprehensible spirit within.

J. LEWIS MAY.

## THE OLDEST CHRISTMAS CAROL

**S**T. LUKE'S GOSPEL tells us that the shepherds at Bethlehem heard the angelic choir sing: "Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace to men of good will." From the earliest times these words were used by Christians as the introduction of a hymn of praise and thanksgiving. There is such a hymn in the text of the Apostolic Constitutions, which probably gives us a tradition of the second if not of the first century A.D. This is a hymn to Christ, whereas the *Gloria in Excelsis*, as we know it, is a hymn to God the Father and then to God the Son. The text of the hymn that we sing at Mass is very like that contained in one of the three earliest manuscripts of the Gospels, the Codex Alexandrinus, now in the British Museum (Codex A). Scholars have disagreed as to whether the text of the Apostolic Constitutions or the text of Codex A. is the really primitive tradition,<sup>1</sup> but that question is not of vital importance, as we can be fairly certain that the text that was first used by the Church in the West represents an even earlier tradition than Codex A.

Many of the early manuscripts say that St. Hilary, who died in 366, first brought the *Gloria in Excelsis* from the eastern to the western Church. Many of these call it *Hymnus S. Hilarii*, and that learned eighteenth-century liturgist, Cardinal Tommasi, adds, "Perhaps he first translated the hymn into Latin and first brought it from the East to the West."<sup>2</sup> Other medieval witnesses in the same sense are the writer known as Pseudo-Alcuin, Remigius of Auxerre, Hugh

<sup>1</sup> Professor J. Lebreton in *Recherches de Science religieuse*, 1923, pp. 322-29, thinks that the earlier text is an Arian edition of what we find in Codex A. Against this might be set the version of the earlier text in MS. Vatic. Gr. 2089 on the lines suggested by Dr. C. H. Turner in *Journal of Theological Studies*, xvi, pp. 55-56, and a Nestorian Syriac text quoted by Jungmann, *Die Stellung Christi in liturgischen Gebet*, Münster, 1925, pp. 145-46.

<sup>2</sup> *Opera Omnia*, Rome, 1748, v. 3, p. 616.

of St. Victor, and Honorius of Autun.<sup>1</sup> There may be some truth in this tradition because the hymn would be a welcome antidote to the contemporaries of St. Hilary against the Arian heresy, seeing that it glorifies God the Son in the same way as God the Father.

When the hymn was first brought to the West it seems likely that it was used at morning prayer, exactly as it had always been used in the East, according to the Apostolic Constitutions (vii, 47), Codex A, St. Athanasius in his work on virginity, and according to the existing practice of the Eastern Church. Those ancient witnesses of our early liturgy, the Bangor Antiphonary, the Irish Book of Hymns, and the Ambrosian Antiphonary, all show that the *Gloria* was part of the morning office.

A Roman tradition says that the hymn was ordered to be sung at the beginning of the night Mass of Christmas by Pope Telesphorus (In *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, I. 129). It is certainly more in place there than in any other liturgical office, and it may be said with truth that, although the West received the hymn from the East, the West has made better use of it. It was only sung at the Bishop's Mass until the end of the eleventh century, but now we associate it with every great feast and especially with the solemn feasts of Christ, Easter and Christmas, when the bells ring and the grand organ bursts out after the intonation of *Gloria in excelsis Deo*. When we think of the wealth of plainsong and polyphonic melody that has been written to accompany the words of this beautiful hymn, and not least Bach's joyous meditation on the meaning, we are surprised at the little importance given to it at the end of the morning office in the Eastern Liturgy.

The text of the hymn as it first reached the West must have been very similar to the actual reading of

<sup>1</sup> *Lib. de divin. offic. c. 40*; *Lib. i. De Celeb. Missae*; *Lib. 2 De Sacram.*; *Lib. i. De Gemma Animaæ*.

Codex A and to that preserved in the Missal. But it seems likely that the best Latin tradition is derived from a text even more primitive than that in Codex A. Thus the text of the Roman Missal at the present day does not mention the Holy Spirit after the name of Christ in the middle of the hymn. Strangely enough the Irish and Ambrosian liturgies add "Et Sancte Spiritus" here on the lines of the Greek. It seems probable that this mention of the Holy Spirit was made after the Macedonian heresies of the fourth century against the godhead of the Holy Spirit and that the hymn of the Roman Missal is the oldest form.

The following is the text of our oldest Christmas carol, as it was probably sung by Christians in the West long before St. Augustine came to England.

Gloria in excelsis Deo  
et in terra pax  
hominibus bonae voluntatis.  
Laudamus te  
benedicimus te  
adoramus te  
glorificamus te  
gratias agimus tibi  
propter magnam gloriam tuam.  
Domine Rex caelestis  
Deus Pater omnipotens.

Domine Fili Unigenite  
Jesu Christe  
Domine Deus  
agnus Dei  
filius Patris  
qui tollis peccata mundi  
miserere nobis  
qui tollis peccata mundi  
suscipe deprecationem nostram  
qui sedes ad dexteram Patris  
miserere nobis  
quoniam tu solus sanctus

tu solus dominus  
Jesu Christe  
in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.

That is the text used today with three omissions. *Deus* after *Domine* and before *Rex caelstis* is absent in Codex A and in many Latin texts. Its addition was probably due to the *Domine Deus* farther on. *Tu solus altissimus* is absent in the same texts and Cardinal Tommasi omits it for this reason. The mention of the Holy Spirit at the end of our hymn is not found in Codex A and the ancient liturgy of Milan places it just before the *Amen*. For this reason it would seem to be an addition in order to complete the doxology to the Holy Trinity.<sup>1</sup>

CHARLES A. BOLTON.

---

<sup>1</sup> Tommasi, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 616.

## HOMILETICS

### *The Circumcision*

Epistle : Tit. ii, 11-15.

NEW Year's Day is traditionally a day for turning over a new leaf, for taking stock of the past, correcting our errors, and replanning the future on better lines. Now, though it may be a mere convention which makes us count this Octave day of the Nativity as the beginning of a new year, there is a sound liturgical reason for regarding it as the opening of a new spiritual era in our lives. With the birth of Our Lord in Bethlehem, the world itself may be said to have turned over a new leaf, because it is around that supremely important event that the whole of human history hinges. It was "epoch-making" in the literal sense of the word, as we show today in our dating. We divide the years of man's passage on earth into two great epochs, B.C. and A.D. All the thousands of years that elapsed before the coming of Christ are of importance to us only in so far as they prepared the way for Him, and we reckon them, not forward from the creation of Adam, but backward from the birth of Christ. So too with the 1938 years that have gone by since Christ was born. We not only count our years from Christ, but we also dedicate each recurring year to Him as an *annus Domini*, a "year of the Lord". Year by year, we celebrate His coming with the feast and octave of Christmas, and then, as if to show how complete a change His coming has wrought, how utterly it has broken with the past, we begin again with renewed hope a new "year of the Lord".

All this we find reflected in today's Epistle. Just as the first Christmas broke the might of paganism and changed the course of history, so must each recurring Christmas change the course of our lives. We are always slipping back into the ungodly and worldly paganism from which the birth of Christ first redeemed mankind. We worry more over security from pain and poverty and unemployment than we worry over security from temptation and sin. We are more concerned about our pleasures and comforts in this

life than we are about our salvation in the next. The world in which we live is pagan and ungodly, and we tend to adopt its philosophy of life. But now Christ is come again to jolt our worldly complacency. Once again "the grace of God hath appeared to all men, instructing us that, denying ungodliness and worldly desires, we should live soberly, and justly, and godly in this world, looking for the blessed hope and coming of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ".

The first lesson of Christmas is, therefore, that we should shake off once again the ungodliness and worldly desires of the past year. Why did God leave His heaven and become our Emmanuel, our "God-with-us", like unto us in all things excepting sin, with all the charm of childhood to break down our cold reserve, if not that He might force His way into our lives? Why was He born in a stable, if not in order to reveal the vanity of our worldliness? We hunt after wealth, and He, with all the riches of the world at His disposal, comes amongst us like the child of a homeless tramp. We hunger for fame, and He, emptying Himself of the glory that is His by divine right, chooses to be born in a manger. We value power, and He, with all the power of the Almighty to command, allows Himself to be hunted into exile by a petty tyrant. Not God Himself could devise a more convincing refutation of our worldliness than the simple facts of His birth.

The second lesson of Christmas is that, having broken with the past and all its errors, we should resolve for the future to "live soberly, and justly, and godly in this world". To live "soberly" means to observe moderation in all our actions, to hold all our passions, lust, greed, anger, envy, in firm control, and to be restrained in the pursuit even of the lawful pleasures and comforts of life. Such sobriety is not won merely by a New Year resolution. Ours is a fallen nature and its unruliness can only be tamed by a lifelong struggle, but surely, confronted as we are today by the utter self-abnegation of Christ in the crib, we cannot refuse to begin the struggle. To live "justly and godly" means to value above all things else that supernatural life of grace, that sonship of God which the Divine Child has won for us by His coming, and to be ready to suffer any

hardship rather than lose our kinship with Christ by mortal sin. Look once again to the Crib, learn from the sinlessness of the Virgin Mary and the godliness of her most chaste spouse how much the Divine Child treasures purity and innocence of heart, and then pledge yourself to live such a life as will make you worthy to kneel with the shepherds at the manger.

The third lesson of Christmas is that we must begin the New Year not only with a change of heart, but with a change of outlook, "looking for the blessed hope and coming of the great God and Our Saviour Jesus Christ". The fault with many of us is that we are trying to live good Catholic lives without knowing quite why we do it, except that we happen to be Catholics and feel a sense of duty to our religion. We see this strange world in which we live, with its pleasure and pain, work and rest, hardship and bereavement, through the eyes of the world, and it puzzles and disheartens us. If we are to give God our reasonable service we must see life with the eyes of faith and face it with the armour of hope. We must see this world simply and solely as a threshold to heaven, a hard road leading to an eternity of happiness, a place of trial where no sacrifice will ever be asked of us, but will one day have its reward. And once again, it is at the Crib that we shall find this enlightening faith and strengthening hope. For the first coming of Christ in hardship and obscurity is a pledge that one day He will come to us in happiness and glory.

*First Sunday after Epiphany : The Holy Family*

*And he went down with them and came to Nazareth, and was subject to them (Gospel).*

At first sight it is one of the most astounding facts of sacred history that, of the thirty-three years Our Lord spent on earth, He spent thirty of them in a cottage. And yet, when we consider the purpose of His mission, that He came not merely to redeem but to rebuild human society, it is, after all, not so surprising. Sin had vitiated mankind at its very root in Adam, and the whole superstructure had

gone awry, so that it was not enough for Our Lord to redeem man from sin ; he had to reconstruct human society from its very foundation. Now, the unit and foundation of human society is not the individual or the State, but the family. That is a truth which is attacked today, openly by the Communists and covertly by the advocates of childless families and easier divorce, but it is a truth none the less. It was God who made the family the rock foundation of human society, and any social reconstruction which is not founded on that rock is foredoomed to failure. That is why Our Lord devoted thirty years to perfecting the model of a Christian family.

And it was worth while, even when we count the cost to the full. True, it meant that St. Joseph, who might have done great things as an apostle, had to spend his lifetime making oddments. It meant that Mary, the masterpiece of God's creation, was doomed to fifty years of household drudgery. It meant that the God-man, whose every moment was infinitely precious, was to spend all but three years of His life, from sunrise to sunset, doing odd jobs, eating His meals and going to bed. The cost in precious time is almost incalculable, but it was not too much, for the vast mass of men are not called to the apostolate, but to the humdrum round of family life, and, therefore, it was the model of the Holy Family that was especially needed, more than the model of Christ the Preacher, almost as much, indeed, as the model of Christ Crucified. Christ the Preacher was to be the exemplar of the chosen few, but Christ the villager, the workman, living in family union with Mary and Joseph, was to be the inspiration of the millions.

And so, at great cost, the mould was set, and there was established for all time the perfect model of the Christian family, complete in every detail and suited to the needs of all. Fathers of families have in St. Joseph a supreme example of fatherly vigilance, patience, and conformity to the will of God. His foster-son was God, and yet he watched over Him as though He were powerless to aid Himself. He sought no special favours and received none. Indeed, everything seemed to be against him. He had to be content with a stable for the birth of his wife's Child, and

then, to crown all, was ordered to flee into Egypt to save It from the murderous fury of Herod. Reduced to the condition of a homeless tramp, he did not cry out against fate, or ask why God could not protect His own, but bowed his head to the holy will of God and went patiently on with his allotted task.

So, too, mothers can find in the virginal mother Mary a perfect model of true piety, womanly modesty and wifely fidelity. She had her full share of cares and worries, but never allowed them to come between her soul and God, accepting every burden in the same spirit as that in which she had undertaken the awful responsibility of divine motherhood : "behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it done unto me according to thy word".

Above all, in Jesus who "was subject to them", sons and daughters have a divinely perfect model of filial obedience and devotion to parents. He was their maker and yet He respected them, their God and yet He obeyed them. They owed all they had to Him and yet He worked for them, gladly and obediently, for thirty out of His thirty-three years of life.

Here, too, is inspiration for all states and conditions of life. The noble-born can find in this family of royal blood how to maintain restraint in prosperity and dignity in adversity. The rich can learn the real value of their wealth when they see its Maker living His lifetime in a one-roomed cottage. But above all, there is comfort and inspiration here for the poor and needy. Keep the Holy Family before your eyes and you will end by thanking God that He has done you the honour of making you not quite so poor as Himself. For I doubt whether in all this parish, in all this land with its crushing burden of unemployment, there is a single family so poor, or so destitute, as was the Holy Family when it begged its way into Egypt or scraped a meagre living at Nazareth. Whatever your cares and worries, at least you share them in common with Jesus, Mary and Joseph.

We tend to idealize sacred things and form a "holy-picture" idea of the Holy Family, whereas the reality was probably as drab as the slum cottages of our derelict villages. We visualize Mary in blue and white and a halo, when,

in reality, she was a poor woman, scrubbing, washing and mending, day after day, like any other poor woman. We picture St. Joseph with a lily and the Divine Child with a sceptre and orb, whereas, in plain fact, if the Incarnation had taken place, not then in Nazareth, but today in England, Jesus and Joseph would be found among the unemployed or earning a pittance at some ill-paid trade, with nothing more romantic than a clean cottage for home.

There can be no room, then, for murmuring, when trials and sorrows afflict your family life. By all means, work and strive to improve your state and to provide for those near and dear to you. What else did Jesus, Mary and Joseph do during those thirty years? Work, if you will, for the eradication of those social injustices which wreck so many homes. Christ Himself denounced them in no uncertain terms. But if, for all your struggling, God gives you failure, do not rise up ungratefully against Him. What you have, He gave you, and if it be little, He gave Himself less. Learn rather, while you struggle, that there is a greater goal, to model your life on Christ's and your home on His, striving as He strove, and content as He was content to meet with failure here, if only you may share His glory hereafter.

*Second Sunday after Epiphany*

Gospel : John ii, 1-11.

**EXPLANATION**

There are several points in the story of the marriage feast of Cana which need elucidation. We are told that when the wine failed, Our Lady turned to Our Lord and said : "They have no wine." Her words, it is true, were a simple statement of fact, but in view of what followed we know that she meant them as a request to Our Lord to provide wine miraculously and so save her friends from confusion. The point is, how came Our Lady to expect so extraordinary a favour from her Son? She had lived with Him for thirty years and, according to the Gospel's own words : "this beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee"—never yet had He used His miraculous power. How was it that

she asked Him to do so now? Well, we know that Our Lady was not only a witness of the extraordinary events which accompanied His birth, but that she had "kept all these words, pondering them in her heart" (Luke ii, 19). For thirty years, therefore, she must have been waiting patiently for the fulfilment of this early promise of future greatness, wondering when her Divine Son, "the expectation of nations" (Gen. xl ix, 10), would begin to exert His hidden might. She had never before asked anything extraordinary of Him, because hitherto He had lived with her in so ordinary a way. But now everything was changing. Only a few days before, on the banks of the Jordan, John the Baptist had proclaimed Him "Son of God" (John i, 34), and declared that the purpose of his own mission was simply "that He may be made manifest in Israel" (ibid. 31). And so Our Lady, convinced that at last His hour was come, turned to Him with confidence and asked Him to manifest Himself for the benefit of her friends.

Our Lord's answer might seem, at first sight, to be almost a rebuff: "Woman, what is it to me and to thee? My hour is not yet come." Not that there is anything harsh in the word "woman"; it might well be translated "lady". But then, "what is it to me and to thee" might equally well read: "what have I to do with thee", and why, we ask, should Our Lord thus suddenly seem to disclaim any special obligation to the Mother whom, for thirty years, He had delighted to honour? Well, for our benefit, more than for Our Lady's, He wanted to stress an important truth. Apparently, He felt it necessary to point out—and we can be sure that He did it in the most gentle and kindly manner—that although He was subject to His mother as man, He was not subject to her as God, and it was an exercise of His divine power that she was now requesting. Moreover, she was requesting it at a moment when, according to the providence of His Father, "His hour was not yet come." One thing is certain, Our Lady evidently did not regard it as a rebuff. Strong in faith, she knew that her Son, precisely because He was also Son of God, was master of His hour, and her long experience of His infinite kindness told her that He would not disappoint her. And so, we are told, she turned at once to the waiters and said: "Whatsoever He

shall say to you, do ye." As we know from the sequel, her faith and trust were promptly and wonderfully rewarded.

#### APPLICATION

There are several important lessons to be learnt from this simple story. To begin with, Our Lord wanted to impress upon us the tremendous importance and significance of Christian marriage. That is why He chose to manifest Himself for the first time, not at a great public gathering, but at a private wedding feast. The sacrament of matrimony was to be of cardinal importance to His work. Not only was it to play a great part in the spread of His church, but it was to symbolize for all time His own mystical union to the Christian Body as His spouse. "For", in the words of St. Augustine, "the Word is the Bridegroom, and human flesh the bride, and both together are one Son of God and Son of Man" (Tr. viii in Joan. c. 4). Secondly, Our Lord, by His gracious presence at the feast, gave His divine approval to our innocent recreations and rejoicings. Christianity, though it means the cross, does not mean gloom. There is room in it for merrymaking, provided always that we can, without shame, invite Jesus and His holy Mother to join with us. Thirdly, we learn from this great miracle the tremendous power of Our Lady's intercession. At a mere word from her, Our Lord alters the dispensation of His providence, advancing the hour of His public life, in order to do her a favour and give pleasure to her friends. What an assurance to us who are not merely friends but children of Mary !

These are the evident lessons of the story, but behind it all there is a deeper meaning. Our Lord could have produced wine in the empty jars without more ado, and if He chose, instead, to have the waterpots filled with water which He then turned into wine, He did so for our enlightenment. St. Paul, of whom God said : "this man is to me a vessel of election" (Acts ix, 15), likens us all to earthenware vessels shaped by the hand of the divine Potter into receptacles of His grace (Rom. ix, 20). Our Lady alone, the "vessel of honour", and "singular vessel of devotion", was from the very first full of grace. But all of us have received a certain measure of God's grace, some two, some

three measures, and all are capable of yet more. God expects our co-operation. He commands us to fill our vessels with the water of good works. It is true that our works are in themselves as worthless as water, but if, like the waiters at the feast, we show a ready obedience to Our Lord's command, He will change the water into "good wine" and present it, as a most acceptable offering, to His heavenly Father, "the chief steward of the feast". It is for us to make a generous response to Our Lord's command, and to fill our vessels, as did the waiters, "to the brim". We have the consolation of Our Lady's unfailing aid. It is at her bidding that we begin the good work—"whatsoever He shall say to you, do ye"—and it is at her request that Our Lord completes and perfects it.

*Third Sunday after Epiphany*

*Go, and as thou hast believed, so be it done to thee (Gospel).*

**EXPLANATION**

It is hard for us to realize that the sternest test to which Our Lord put His contemporaries was the test of faith in His divinity. It seems quite natural to us to accept the fact that Christ was not only truly man but truly God, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity "made flesh" for our redemption, and we imagine that, if we had been privileged to meet Him in His lifetime, we would have knelt to Him in adoration, as promptly and as devoutly as we kneel to Him in adoration in our churches today. Actually, our faith is anything but natural, it is purely supernatural. The Incarnation, the fact that the almighty God became a man, and that a man was God, is a baffling, staggering truth which we accept only because we have received the gift of faith in baptism, and because, unlike Our Lord's contemporaries, we have seen all His tremendous claims proved to the hilt in His own and in His Church's history.

Our Lord's contemporaries, on the contrary, had neither Baptism nor history to help them. They knew Him simply as an artisan of Nazareth who had abandoned His tools

and taken to preaching. They admitted that He spoke "as one having authority", and that He had "done all things well", making "both the deaf to hear and the dumb to speak". But, after all, if He did extraordinary things, He made still more extraordinary claims. There had been prophets before who had worked miracles to prove that they had been sent by God; but this man was different: He claimed to be the God who sent the prophets. It was a hard saying, and who could hear it?

It was so hard a saying that Our Lord never failed to reward those who showed themselves ready to accept it. It was for faith that He cured the woman with an issue of blood: "Be of good heart, daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole" (Matt. ix. 22). To the two blind men He said: "According to your faith, be it done unto you" (Matt. ix, 29). When the Syro-Phoenician woman pestered Him to cure her daughter, He capitulated in the end with the words: "O woman, great is thy faith, be it done to thee as thou wilt" (Matt. xv, 28). So too, it was faith that healed the man sick of the palsy (Matt. ix, 2), faith that gave sight to the man born blind (John ix, 38), faith that cleansed the leper mentioned in today's gospel, faith that snatched the ruler's son from the jaws of death (John iv, 53), faith that changed Mary Magdalen, in a moment, from a great sinner into a great saint (Luke vii, 50).

But, though so many of Our Lord's miracles were worked as a reward of faith, it was not always the same kind of faith. He was not exigent, and responded often enough to what was little more than confidence in His power to work wonders. But He wanted more, and when He found it, as He did in the centurion, He was not slow to express His delight. The centurion, you will notice, did not appeal merely to Our Lord's power with God to obtain a cure: he appealed to Our Lord's power as *God* to command a cure. He did not say: "Pray for my servant and he shall be healed"; He said: "Command, as I command my soldiers, and what you order shall be done." Even Martha, Our Lord's intimate friend, did not show such complete faith when she came to Him to plead for the resurrection of her brother Lazarus. "I know," she said, "that whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee." Indeed, Our Lord's reply to her was

almost like a reproach. "I," He said, "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in *me*, although he be dead, shall live: and everyone that liveth, and believeth in me, shall not die for ever. Believeth thou this?" Martha's response to this challenge made complete amends: "Yea, Lord," she said, "I have believed that thou art Christ the Son of the Living God, who art come into this world" (John xi, 22-27).

The centurion on the contrary needed no such challenge. His faith in Our Lord's divine authority was spontaneous and complete. "If I," he argued, "a mere man, subject to authority, can command men and they obey, then clearly you who are more than man, you who are not subject to authority, can command Death to go, and it will obey and be gone." No wonder Our Lord marvelled, saying: "Amen, I say to you, I have not found so great faith in Israel." And what made this profession of faith even more impressive was the profound humility of the man who uttered it. St. Luke, in his account of this miracle, adds an illuminating incident. The centurion, at first, considering himself unworthy even to approach Our Lord, sent the Jewish elders to plead his case. They thought highly of him. "He is worthy," they said to Our Lord, "that thou shouldst do this for him" (Luke vii, 4). How different was His own opinion of himself: "Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof, but say only the word, and my servant shall be healed."

#### APPLICATION

We are told by St. Luke that the centurion's servant was "dear to him". Most of us have someone near and dear to us, who is sick, and not with the sickness of the body, but with the sickness of the soul, someone who has fallen away from God, someone whose eternal life may depend on our prayers. We are inclined to forget our debt of piety and charity, to shrug our shoulders and say: "Am I my brother's keeper?" We pray, perhaps, but how seldom with true humility. As practising Catholics, we feel that we deserve a readier answer, that we "are worthy that God should do this for us". Not until we realize, with the centurion, how utterly unworthy we are that God should even enter under

our roof, can we expect Him to listen readily to our request. But above all, we must have faith, faith lively and compelling, as was the centurion's. It is true that, unlike the Jews, we have faith in Our Lord's divinity, in His power to heal our sick friend. What we lack, and what we must arouse in our hearts, is faith in His readiness to use His power. And our faith must be coupled with good works: we must hate sin in ourselves, if we are to conquer it in another, for "faith without works is dead" (Jas. ii, 20).

*Fourth Sunday after Epiphany*

*Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith (Gospel).*

**EXPLANATION**

In the slow and often painful process of schooling His Apostles, Our Lord had two essential tasks to accomplish. To begin with, He had to win them by gradual stages, proportioned to their meagre capacity, to a convinced and open profession of faith in His divinity, and then, as a consequence of this, and with a view to their future duties, He had to arouse in their sluggish hearts a sense of absolute confidence in His all-seeing providence, almighty power and unfailing fidelity to His promises. It was with this two-fold object in view that Our Lord entered the boat with His Apostles and put out to sea.

The storm into which He was deliberately leading them was to serve an immediate purpose, for it was to forge one more link in the chain of evidence that would eventually compel them to see in Him, not merely the man of God, but the God-man. At the same time, it was to serve an almost equally important ulterior purpose as a type of the trials and dangers that lay in store for them in their future work. The day was to come when they would cry out with St. Paul: "We would not have you ignorant, brethren, of our tribulation which came to us in Asia, that we were pressed out of measure above our strength, so that we were weary even of life (II Cor. i, 8)". When that day came they would not have the comfort and support of Christ's visible presence, but would need to rely on their faith and hope alone. Their

faith and hope must, therefore, be put, here and now, to a rigorous test.

To make the test more rigorous and searching, Our Lord begins, as you will notice, by emphasizing His weakness as a man. Nothing could more effectively obscure the reality of His Godhead than an exhibition of that bodily weariness to which He had made Himself subject, when He took our frail flesh, and so, as if to force His weakness upon the attention of His Apostles, he yields to the demands of His human nature and falls asleep on a pillow in the stern of the boat.

The test proved to be too rigorous. When the "great tempest arose, so that the boat was covered with waves", their faith in Christ failed them, and still more their hope. Seeing Him only as a man unaware of their danger, and blind to the hidden Godhead in Him that never sleeps, they lost heart. Past experience of His power told them that, were He awake and aware of what was happening, He might be able to do something. But either He didn't know, or He didn't care, and if He didn't act soon it would be too late. So they clustered round Him in the stern of the boat, shouting above the roar of the storm : "Master, we perish" (Luke viii, 24), "Master, doth it not concern thee that we perish?" (Mark iv, 38), "Lord, save us, we perish."

Our Lord awoke, impressive in His divine tranquillity, and gazed reproachfully into their frightened eyes. Had their faith been such as His previous miracles had warranted they would not have been afraid, and so, before rebuking the elements, He first of all rebuked them : "Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?" "Then rising up, he commanded the winds and the sea, and there came a great calm."

The extraordinary abruptness with which, at His word of command, the wind dropped and complete stillness followed on the roar of the storm left the Apostles utterly bewildered. They were confronted by that paradox which underlies the mystery of the Incarnation, on the one side, the frailty of man, on the other the almighty power of God. One moment they had seen Our Lord sleeping like the man He was, and the next moment He was commanding the sea as though He were its Maker. Even the manner of

His intervention was divine in its majestic simplicity. He had waved no mystical rod, as did Moses over the Red Sea : He had merely commanded the wind and the sea as their Creator, and they had obeyed Him instantly as His creature. The Apostles, it is true, were still too slow of discernment to draw the astonishing and yet inevitable conclusion. The miracle did not open their eyes fully to the hidden Godhead of its worker, for Our Lord was later to complain : "Are you also yet without understanding?" (Matt. xv, 16). But it disturbed their placid presumption that things are always as they are seen with the eyes of the body, and set them wondering : "What manner of man is this, for the winds and the sea obey Him?" And when, with the Resurrection of Our Lord from the dead, their eyes were opened fully to the mystery of His divinity, the memory of that suddenly stilled sea must have been to them an abiding source of hope and consolation, assuring them of His all-seeing eye and ever-present aid and protection.

#### APPLICATION

"The life of man upon earth is a warfare," said Job, "and his days are like the days of a hireling" (vii, 1). We were not meant to drift along through untroubled waters to an unmerited heaven : we were meant to pull our way to it in the storm-tossed ship of St. Peter, through fair weather and foul, "for the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent bear it away" (Matt. xi, 12). God, in His mercy, may bring us from time to time into calmer waters, where we can recoup our strength for further effort, but we can be sure that there are storms still to come, storms so great, perhaps, as to make us fear the worst. They come to the Church as a whole, as we see today in Russia, Germany, Spain and Mexico. They come to us as individuals, as we know to our cost. We cannot see Our Lord with our bodily eyes, but our faith tells us that He is in our very midst, and that He "will not suffer us to be tempted above that which we are able" (I Cor. x, 13). He may seem to have forgotten us, to be sleeping, but we who believe Him to be God know that He can never forget (Isaias xlix, 15). With such faith in our hearts, we may cry out : "Lord, save us, we perish", and Our Lord will

not rebuke us. But whether we cry out or not, as long as we continue to struggle manfully in a spirit of faith and hope, we can be sure that He will not fail us, but will presently arise to command the winds and the sea, and there will come a great calm.

LAWRENCE LESLIE MCREAVY.

## NOTES ON RECENT WORK

### I. ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY

WAS St. Augustine a mystic? The reply of many would be unhesitating. They would agree with the late Abbot Butler that Augustine was the Prince of Mystics; or with the ardent Augustinian, P. Cayré, that he was undoubtedly raised to the highest degree of transforming union with God and that therein lies the secret of his amazing intellectual power and influence. The conclusion seems to be overwhelming when one considers Augustine's constant sense of God's presence, his experiences, in which "in the flash of a trembling glance" he attained Him who is; his ceaseless insistence on the contemplation or vision of God; and his masterful grasp and exposition of holy wisdom.

But, strange as it may seem, not all admit that St. Augustine was a mystic in the strict sense of the term; in the sense, that is, of infused, passive contemplation. It is a delicate question; and the writer of these notes is not competent to make a decision where specialists disagree. He can only indicate the arguments of the opposition, as they are set forth by a recent exponent, E. Hendrikx, O.E.S.A. and synopsized in the latest number of the *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique*.

Dr. Hendrikx's fundamental argument is taken from St. Augustine's theory of human knowledge. That theory involved the use of such terms as "contemplatio" or "intuitus"; but they did not bear the narrow meaning which the subsequent development of Christian spiritual theology was to give them. Unlike St. Thomas, St. Augustine did not regard the intellect as passive in the act of knowing. For him it was an active faculty. Illumined by the Divine Sun both in itself and in its act and object, the mind by its own power took hold, so to say, of truth. Hence "contemplatio" meant an active process, a seizing of the truth that irradiated the mind. It would seem, therefore, that St. Augustine had never experienced a way of prayer in which the impression of passivity is dominant. Had he done so, he would have modified his theory to embrace it;

for even in his most metaphysical moments he was always the psychologist.

To support and explain his fundamental argument, Dr. Hendrikx proceeds to analyse in detail the writings of St. Augustine. In his earlier Catholic writings, before he became a bishop, the Saint is gradually freeing himself from those elements of Neoplatonism which were incompatible with the Catholic doctrines of humility and charity. But the Platonic doctrine of knowledge and the Platonic terminology remain his. His hunger for God is keen, but he conceives no other way of attaining Him except by rising from the consideration of creation and the study of his own soul. His prayer is characteristically affective.

About the time of his election to the episcopate, Augustine's spiritual system has become fixed. Its central idea is the renovation of man in the image of God. Soiled and corrupted by sin, man must be restored to his primitive purity, as far as the state of sin will permit. Now the most Godlike thing in man, the constituent in which he most closely resembles his Creator, is his reason. Therefore in the restoration of man as God's image, it is his reason which must, above all, be renewed. This renewal is achieved by the active seizing of God. Augustine describes the stages of the soul's ascent to this contemplation of God. At the summit is wisdom. Wisdom is contemplation; but not infused contemplation of modern mysticism. It is an active hold on God, achieved by the efforts of man who rises, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost and of grace, above the created by mental and moral detachment. Dr. Hendrikx concludes, from an examination of the most striking texts of St. Augustine, that they teach nothing more than acquired contemplation. It is in acquired contemplation that St. Augustine's ideal of the Christian life, which is holy wisdom, consists.

St. Alphonsus's *Glories of Mary* has recently been published in a new English translation.<sup>1</sup> The anonymous translator has produced an English version which is a delight to read. The printing is excellent; and there are several good illustrations of famous Madonnas. St. Alphonsus intended his work for devout readers and preachers. It is not strictly

<sup>1</sup> London: Saint Peter's Press. 10s. 6d.

a dogmatic treatise ; but it has a very definite place in the history of the doctrine of our Lady's universal mediatorial intercession. To that doctrine St. Alphonsus here gives all the weight of his authority. The book is a commentary on the *Salve Regina*. It is a mosaic of quotations from Saints and devout writers. A story is given to illustrate each section and a prayer concludes it. The translator has used the most authentic Italian edition. He omits the appendix or second part of the original, which he will publish in a further volume. The omitted part consists of meditations on the principal feasts and virtues of our Blessed Lady.

The work will always have great value from its essential thesis ; but in certain accessory elements, for instance, in the absence of the critical faculty when dealing with quotations and stories, it is very definitely dated. In its exuberant piety it is Italian. There is no injustice done, nor irreverence offered to St. Alphonsus, in saying this. He was a man of his time and of his people. I might not have made this criticism had not the translator himself indulged in a criticism of the Catholics of England in the following unmeasured terms : "Who can deny that here in England devotion to Mary is cold, at best lukewarm ? This country was once the Dowry of Mary. Yet even those who should be bravest and most zealous in Her service are timid, it would appear, fearful and practised in the exercise of icy reserve. I have known it said that the Cult of Mary, that devotions to the Madonna, are not 'suited to the English temperament'. What folly of hell is this !" I cannot bring myself to believe that devotion is deep and intense only when it is expressed in hyperbole and accompanied by ebullitions of sentiment. Ever and anon one meets this criticism of our own Catholics, which I am resisting ; it is unjust, and it shows a great want of understanding.

*At the School of St. Thérèse of the Child Jesus*<sup>1</sup> is a kind of Imitation of the Little Flower. In a series of dialogues between her and the soul the "Little Way" is fully developed. Abundant quotations from the great spiritual writers support the teaching of St. Thérèse. Written by the Carmelites of

<sup>1</sup> Translated by V. Rev. Michael Collins, A.M., in collaboration with the Carmel of Kilmacud. Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. Pp. xvi+80. 2s. 6d.

Lisieux, it is a commentary on her spirit by those who were most conversant with her and her ideals. For all these reasons it is a very valuable little book.

*A Modern Mystic*<sup>1</sup> is another Carmelite book. It is the Life of Mother Mary Teresa of the Angels (1855-1930), a French Carmelite, who discovered, independently of St. Thérèse, the Way of Spiritual Childhood and lived by it during a long life. After trying her vocation with the Canonesses of St. Augustine, Mother Teresa entered Carmel in 1886. For most of her religious life she held the office of Prioress in various convents in France, Switzerland, and Belgium. She was in Belgium during the war years. The inner meaning of Carmel and the response of Mother Teresa to its exactions and its graces are indicated with rare skill by the anonymous biographer. So, too, are the particular difficulties which she encountered as Prioress, some of them common to any Prioress, but others special to herself in the unique troubles which attended religious life for French nuns during many years. Her ideal was the home at Nazareth. She was a liberal-minded woman, distinguished for great charity, simplicity and spiritual joy. She experienced many mystical phenomena, visions, locutions and diabolical assaults. The biographer does not enter into any criticism of these. In any case they are incidental to sanctity, and the rare holiness of Mother Teresa is manifest independently of them. It is proposed to promote her Cause, and the book closes with a short list of favours which are attributed to her intercession.

*The Priceless Pearl or Humility of Heart*<sup>2</sup> is an admirable little book. The original was written by an almost unknown Spanish writer, Don Sans of Santa Catharina, for his religious. It is excellently translated by an American Sister of Notre Dame. To meditate on its full and many-sided analysis of humility would profit much every soul seeking perfection.

J. CARTMELL.

<sup>1</sup> By an Irish Carmelite. Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. Pp. ix + 123. 5s.

<sup>2</sup> Columba Series. Geo. E. J. Coldwell, Ltd. Pp. 78. 2s. 6d.

## II. PASTORAL THEOLOGY

Twelve months ago Catholics, clergy and laity, were still asking the question, What is Catholic Action? There is little excuse for ignorance on that point today, though there may still be a certain vagueness about the implications of the definition. During the year the Clergy have had the opportunity of reading a number of books and articles dealing with Catholic Action in its different phases; congresses and public meetings have been held all over the country, and every pastor of souls must have heard the voice of the Chief Shepherd proclaiming that a most important duty of the priest is to prepare the laity for their apostolate. By now the skeleton of the organization has been built up in most dioceses, and priests and people are busily, even feverishly, engaged in various good works undertaken at the suggestion of the Hierarchy. But it is not too much to say that the real work of Catholic Action has hardly begun. The criticism that we are only doing what we have always done, but with a little more energy and a great deal more fuss, is still to be heard. Already that criticism can be adequately answered, for it can be pointed out that even if the material work were the same its formality is different. Many of the laity have really enlisted themselves to carry out what they recognize, perhaps still superficially, logically rather than really, to be their own apostolate. The essential element that is still lacking, an element that must take years to evolve, is the truly Catholic formation of the Catholic Actionist. It is comparatively easy to find men and women ready to follow a lead and, even at considerable self-sacrifice, to beg or to canvass, to go from house to house trying to increase membership of Catholic societies or to induce their fellows to take a Catholic newspaper, to attend mass meetings and pass resolutions. And, of course, that is all to the good. But you will still go far to seek among Catholics that spontaneity of expression, that freedom of action which comes from a knowledge of the truth. They have still to realize that Catholic Action means vitalism, spontaneous reaction to stimulus from without, autonomous movement, conscious independence within the sphere of

Catholic truth whose boundaries they know and loyally accept. They have, of course, to co-operate with the Hierarchy; they are, in Monsignor Civardi's phrase, not architects but masons. But they have to be qualified and intelligent craftsmen, and for that they will have to serve an intense apprenticeship. They must at least know what Christianity implies in the spheres of thought and of action, and they must know the real nature of that world which is arrayed against Christianity.

The need for such formation of the leaders of Catholic Action is the subject of a small but very inspiring book which has been translated from the original German into French under the title *Le Vrai Chrétien En Face Du Monde Réel*.<sup>1</sup>

The original book first appeared last Christmas, when the author was still Professor of Pastoral Theology at the University of Vienna and a preacher of distinction in Austria. The only salvation of the world, he maintains, lies in the triumph of Christian principles, and that depends on Catholics whose lives are in harmony with their profession, whose minds are thoroughly informed with Catholic principles, and whose conduct shows that the truth has made them *free*. It is not theology or apologetics that will convert the free-thinker or the communist. Indispensable as theology is to the Church, it is only men who can convert men. There is a conflict of "-isms", but the reconciliation must come through the "-ists".

Taking for his text Pius XI's condemnation of luke-warmness ("Il n'est plus permis aujourd'hui à personne d'être médiocre") the author deplores the sin of "the unlit lamp and the ungirt loin". The true Christian is not the man who is content with a profession of Catholicism or an external performance of the duties of religion, but he who has taken to heart the teaching of Christ in its fullness and will make a bid to adapt his life to that teaching or, at least (for the author is a realist), will strike his breast and confess himself an unworthy member of the thorn-crowned Head. He observes that many Catholics are unmoved by the sufferings of the victims of industrialism, that after

<sup>1</sup> Par Chan. Michel Pflieger, traduit par l'Abbé Roblin. Casterman, Paris. Pp. 196. 15frs.

doing their duty by a State which has elevated itself into a "universal Providence" they will consider that they have no further responsibility, as if personal human distress were just an impersonal accident of justice (p. 137).

On the other hand, he finds that in those who, despairing of any other source of succour, have thrown in their lot with socialist, bolshevist or free-thinker, there often remains a passion for justice and pity which, far from being a corrupt thing, is the good on which we must seize as our way of approach.

He is not content that Catholics should be always in leading-strings. Loyal to the Church and to the teaching of the Hierarchy, learning as we all must do from the *ecclesia docens*, the Catholic laity who are going to lead Catholic Action must show that the truth has made them free. The enemies of the Church fear above all things the intellectual enslavement which they conceive to be inseparable from Catholicism. To meet these men and win them we need Catholics who not only profess the faith and have external piety, but men who show by word and deed that they are led by the Holy Spirit and burn to work with Him in the world. In short, the Catholic must be "emancipated", capable of speaking and acting in the name of the Church, and when a case crops up in his own circle ready to assume his responsibility as a Catholic (pp. 77, 78).

And surely that is the next step, and the most important, in our own campaign for Catholic Action in this country. The Hierarchy have, of course, recognized it. Hence their insistence on the establishment of study-circles and on the spiritual formation by parish priests or ecclesiastical assistants. The formation of the Catholic Action College in Liverpool is a notable example. The Catholic information of the intellect in varying degrees and for various select groups has been the work of the C.E.G., the C.S.G., and, in a very special way, of the Aquinas Society. But for Catholic Action on a large scale throughout the country there is much still to be done.

Canon Pfleigler recognizes the value and the limitations of political activity for the restoration of a Christian society. Ideas similar to his are expressed very clearly and vigorously in the Editorial of the October-November issue of *Integration*,

a magazine which exhibits just that quality of independence of judgement based on conscious Catholicism which so fully occupies the thoughts of the Viennese professor. The earnest Catholic laymen of Cambridge University who are responsible for this publication are to be congratulated on setting an example to the country at large, but especially to the educated classes. Other Catholic journalists, sometimes poles apart in political outlook, are showing similar keenness for social justice. They are liable to make mistakes, as is anybody who attempts to apply authoritative principles to particular concrete cases, but as long as they are really Catholic in mind and heart and are prepared to be corrected by the competent authority, the error will not be permanent or very harmful. Such men bear witness to that liberty of the children of God which cannot be enjoyed by those who have not a conscious possession of the truth.

The same preoccupation with the social problem is manifested by Cardinal Bertram in a retreat translated into French entitled (in the French translation), *Charismes de la Vie Sacerdotale*.<sup>1</sup> These discourses are primarily directed to the spiritual formation of the priest, but they are full of sound advice for every department of pastoral work and are obviously based on long pastoral experience. While the illustrious author sets the high standard of priestly perfection which is to be anticipated in a retreat, he manifests an urbanity and a breadth of view not always to be found in works of this character. By precept and by present example he insists on the formative function of the liturgy which is now universally recognized as an integral element of Catholic Action, but so far is he from narrowness and rigidity that, in the name of local custom and necessity, he resists the clamour of the purists for the exclusion of the vernacular chant from the principal Sunday Mass (pp. 210, 211). Again in the matter of catechetical instruction (pp. 274, 275), he stands for the old technique of memorizing the catechism, though he pleads for the enriching of the lessons by a constant inculcation of the personal love of our Lord.

This book may be confidently recommended to priests for spiritual reading, for meditation or for excellent practical advice on preaching and all other pastoral activities.

<sup>1</sup>Casterman, Paris.

The supreme influence of a personal love of Christ in the formation of the young is similarly recognized by Dr. Russell in his *Christ The Leader*.<sup>1</sup> This is a life of Christ adapted to school instruction. A gospel passage is followed by a commentary. The element of doctrine is then explained, and simple application to the affairs of human life follows. This scheme of Our Lord's life would enable the teacher to tell the story effectively and cover the whole ground. He would probably vary the application to the needs of his own pupils. It is a handsome volume and not too dear.

Three new volumes of Sunday sermons have come our way. *The Sunday Epistles*<sup>2</sup> by its attention to the general setting of the text and its practical lessons will encourage the priest to seek his subject occasionally in the epistle rather than in the gospel, or, perhaps even better, to found his sermon on the two readings taken together, and thus remedy the too frequent fault of ignoring the epistle. *Dominicales*<sup>3</sup> gives for each Sunday, in addition to the usual explanation and application of the text, a liturgical page, a page on the saint of the week, notes for the stimulation of vocations, and a page of application to Catholic Action. *Les Evangiles du Dimanche*<sup>4</sup> gives each week a useful explanation of the circumstances of the gospel reading followed by the moral application.

T. E. FLYNN.

---

<sup>1</sup>By W. H. Russell, Ph.D., of the Catholic University of America. Bruce Publishing Co. & Coldwell, London. Pp. 458 and two maps. 8s. 6d.

<sup>2</sup> By The Rev. E. C. Messenger, Ph.D. Burns Oates. 6s.

<sup>3</sup> Par Eug. Duplessy, Pierre Tequi, Paris.

<sup>4</sup> Par Chanoine P. Magaud. Tequi, Paris.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

### HOMILY ON THE GOSPEL.

Is there any express law which requires the sermon at the chief Mass on Sunday to be explanatory of the Gospel of the day rather than an exposition of some other portion of Christian doctrine? (M.E.)

### REPLY.

(i) Liturgically it is quite evident, from the fact that the sermon at Mass follows immediately after the Gospel, that the matter of the discourse should be on those portions of Holy Scripture read during the Mass. It was the custom of the Early Church and has been preserved for centuries.<sup>1</sup>

(ii) Canon 1344, §1 : "Diebus dominicis ceterisque per annum festis de praecepto proprium cuiusque parochi officium est, consueta homilia, praesertim intra Missam in qua maior soleat esse populi frequentia, verbum Dei populo nuntiare." The meaning of the words "consueta homilia" is usually taken to be an explanation of the Gospel : "Homilia dicitur potissimum pastoralis adhortatio ex explanato textu evangelico deprompta."<sup>2</sup> "Homilia vocatur praesertim concio in qua textus Evangelii explanatur et ex illo exhortationes morales cruentur."<sup>3</sup> Other Canons of the Code, e.g. Canons 1332, 1333, deal with a parish priest's obligation to impart a knowledge of Christian doctrine in general. It is, therefore, implied that the obligation of Canon 1344, §1, concerns something more specified and determined, and an indication of this may be seen in a letter sent by the *Sacred Congregation of the Council* to the Ordinaries of Italy, 31 May, 1920, which invites them, amongst other things, to say whether all parish priests of their dioceses (a) explain the Gospel to the people on Sundays and Holidays of Obligation, (b) explain Christian doctrine to adults on those same days.<sup>4</sup>

(iii) But this law is widely interpreted, both by the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Fortescue, *The Mass*, p. 284.

<sup>2</sup> Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome Iuris Canonici*, II, n. 679.

<sup>3</sup> Claeys-Bouaert, *Manuale Iuris Canonici*, II, n. 149.

<sup>4</sup> A.A.S., 1920, XII, p. 299.

commentators and by custom. The authors quoted above state that the discourse should be chiefly or generally on the Gospel, but it is agreed that the law is observed even though, on occasion, some other subject is taken. *Liverpool Synod XXII*, 1932, n. 215, reflects this interpretation: "Potest quandoque consuetae homiliae, non tamen habitualiter, concio de alia re idonea substitui." Fortescue observes that it is permissible to preach also on the Epistle;<sup>1</sup> and many are accustomed to take the Collect or some other part of the Proper. Fanfani gives the widest possible interpretation of "homily" in this canon: "in forma homiletica: id est, per modum facilis commentarii ad sanctum Evangelium, vel per modum instructionis et exhortations super uno vel alio capite doctrinae et moralis christianae".<sup>2</sup>

Our conclusion must be that the sermon of the parish priest at the chief Mass on Sundays should normally and habitually be based on the Gospel, but it is a very elastic rule and it is permitted to depart from it, on occasion, and speak of something which cannot be connected, even remotely, with the lesson or words of the Gospel. The objection to the rule is that the people get to know very intimately certain portions of the Gospel, and certain lessons to be drawn from them, but remain uninformed about other points of doctrine, since they do not come at those times when Christian doctrine in general is explained to them. The objection is a valid one, but seeing that there is a law—elastic though it is—which specifies the subject-matter of the discourse at the chief Mass in parish churches, we think it should not be habitually disregarded unless such a practice is countenanced by the Ordinary.<sup>3</sup> E. J. M.

#### BAPTISM—PAROCHIAL RIGHT.

Parents dwelling in other parishes frequently bring children to be baptized in my parish, since the church can be more conveniently reached. Is it quite in order for me to baptize them without the express permission of their own parish priests? (B.W.)

<sup>1</sup> *Op. Cit.* p. 285, note i.

<sup>2</sup> *De Iure Parochorum*, n. 220.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Jansen, *Canonical Provisions for Catechetical Instruction*, Washington, 1937, p. 100.

## REPLY.

Canon 738, §1 : "Minister Ordinarius baptismi solemnis est sacerdos ; sed eius collatio reservatur parocho vel alii sacerdoti de eiusdem parochi vel Ordinarii licentia, quae in casu necessitatis legitime praesumitur." §2 : "Etiam peregrinus a parocho proprio in sua paroecia solemniter baptizetur, si id facile et sine mora fieri potest ; secus peregrinum quilibet parochus in suo territorio potest solemniter baptizare."

Canon 774, §1 : "Quaelibet parochialis ecclesia, revocato ac reprobato quovis contrario statuto vel privilegio vel consuetudine, baptismalem habeat fontem, salvo legitimo iure cumulativo aliis ecclesiis iam quaeasito." §2 : "Loci Ordinarius potest pro fidelium commoditate permittere vel iubere ut fons baptismalis ponatur etiam in alia ecclesia vel publico oratorio inter paroeciae fines."

(i) *Parochus proprius*, in this connection, is the priest in whose parish the parents of the candidate have a domicile or quasi-domicile.<sup>1</sup> By the common law solemn baptism is reserved to this priest, and his right is violated by any other priest who administers the sacrament without proper authorization. To this law, as to most positive laws, there are exceptions. Local law or legitimate custom may sanction a departure from the common law. Fanfani records that in Rome itself there is an ancient custom of taking infants to be baptized at St. Peter's.<sup>2</sup> Canon 774 provides for an exception in favour of churches, other than the parish church, which have acquired a *cumulative right* to a font. Blat defines this as a right whereby people may be baptized lawfully in that place, as well as in the parish church. A reply of the Code Commission, 12 November, 1922, declared that such cumulative right cannot, in future, be acquired by custom. A church which, before the Code, had an exclusive right to a font, now possesses merely a cumulative right, according to the prescriptions of Canon 774.<sup>3</sup>

(ii) The exception which is most likely to operate in this country is mentioned in Canon 738, namely, a case of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Canon 94.

<sup>2</sup> *Jus Parochorum*, n. 244.

<sup>3</sup> *A.A.S.*, 1922, XIV, p. 662 ; Bouscaren, *Digest*, p. 345.

necessity when the permission of the parish priest is to be presumed. The necessity in question is clearly not the extreme kind, arising in danger of death, when any lay person may baptize privately, or any priest may baptize with the ceremonies, as Canon 759 determines. It is *necessitas communis*, and examples of it suggested by the authors are: the case of people coming from a long distance and finding that the parish priest is absent, or the fear that baptism will be neglected unless it is administered at once. In the circumstances in which we are living, which are largely those of a missionary country, a priest should never refuse to baptize the subject of another parish priest, in our view, since the law is not clearly known by the people, and there is a much wider principle than that of Canon 738 to be kept always in mind, namely, the principle that the sacraments are not to be refused to those who seek them reasonably. But the faithful should be informed of their obligations in this respect; it is not that a parish priest is unduly jealous of his legal rights, but that as pastor of souls he is responsible for the baptism of infants within his territory. E. J. M.

#### COMMUNICATIO IN SACRIS.

Is it obligatory, or at least permitted, for a Catholic to assist at Mass celebrated by an Orthodox schismatic priest in order to fulfil the Sunday precept. It is supposed that there is no Catholic church in the district and that attendance is not accompanied by any scandal or danger of perversion. (Z.)

#### REPLY.

It is not permitted, except in the extreme necessity arising from danger of death, to communicate formally in schismatic rites. Material or passive presence is permitted, for appropriate reasons, and with the necessary precautions, exactly as it is permitted, from Canon 1258, §2, at the religious rites of any non-Catholic body. Canon 1258, §1, contains a general prohibition: "Haud licitum est fidelibus quovis modo active assistere seu partem habere in sacris

acatholicorum." From Canon 21: "Leges latae ad praecavendam periculum generale, urgent, etiamsi in casu peculiari periculum non adsit." The conclusion must be that, in a case of this sort, the law of Sunday Mass need not be observed.

Moreover, quite apart from any positive laws on the subject, it is in reality ruled by another consideration. Formal communication in non-Catholic rites implies, in some measure, an implicit external denial of Catholic faith or unity, and is, therefore, forbidden, even though there is no scandal and no danger of perversion.<sup>1</sup> The suspension of this rule in danger of death is only apparent, for the circumstances are such as to preclude any approval, even external, of a non-Catholic sect. The Church, in addition, gives faculties to any priest *in periculo mortis*, and by this grant of jurisdiction is presumed to have lifted the ban against communicating with him.

E. J. M.

#### PRECEDENCE IN RECEIVING HOLY COMMUNION.

It is my custom, in a nuptial Mass, to communicate the bride and bridegroom before the servers, since they have the place of honour on this occasion. Some, however, maintain that the server, even if a layman, always precedes everyone else, including clerics who are not serving? (W.)

#### REPLY.

*Rituale Romanum*, Tit. iv, cap. 2, n. 4: "Postea ad communicandum accedit, incipiens ab iis qui sunt ad partem Epistolae; sed primo, si Sacerdotibus, vel aliis ex Clero danda sit Communio, iis ad gradus altaris genuflexis praebeatur. . ." *Ibid.* n. 11: "Intra Missam autem communio populi statim post communionem Sacerdotis celebrantis fieri debet. . ." N. 12: "Itaque, si qui sint communicandi intra Missam, Sacerdos . . . porrigit com-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1934, Vol. VIII, p. 286.

municandis Eucharistiam, incipiens a ministris altaris, si velint communicare."

*Missa Votiva pro Sponso et Sponsa* : "Sacerdos . . . postquam sumpserit Sanguinem, communicet Sponsos : et prosequatur Missam."

*S.R.C.*, 13 July, 1658, n. 1074 : "In casu praedicto ministrum sacrificii non ratione praeminentiae, sed ministerii, praferendum esse ceteris quamvis dignioribus." *Ibid*, 30 January, 1915, n. 4328 : "Nomine ministri altaris vel sacrificii Missae venit quilibet clericus vel laicus, Missae ad altare inserviens, qui praferendus est ceteris in distributione sacrae Synaxeos ; cauto tamen, ut laico inservienti praferantur clerci, et clericis minoris ordinis alii in maiore ordine constituti, aut personae quae superiori polleant dignitate liturgice attendenda per se (uti regum) vel per accidens (uti sponsorum in Missa pro benedicendis nuptiis)."

The liturgical texts quoted above do not expressly solve the difficulty proposed. The writers generally deduced from them that the lay server should precede all others, though some made an exception for priests or deacons communicating, e.g. on Holy Thursday, in surplice and stole. The reply, *S.R.C.*, n. 1074, does not expressly consider the presence of clerics in major orders : it directed in general terms that the server preceded "monialibus vel ceteris ibidem praesentibus" ; but the conclusion could rightly be drawn that the server preceded everyone including the clergy. The last direction, *S.R.C.*, n. 4328, makes the rule now perfectly clear, namely, that the server has precedence only over others of the same liturgical rank as himself. Therefore, when clerics are communicating they take precedence over the lay server ; likewise, the bride and bridegroom at a nuptial Mass have the same precedence. If the server at a nuptial Mass is a cleric in major orders, the point is not expressly decided, but we agree with a commentator on this decree in *Periodica*, 1919, VIII, p. 249, that an exception to the usual rule of clerics preceding the laity is here established, in favour of bride and bridegroom. Another fairly common case indicated by the same writer, on analogy with the exceptions mentioned in the decree, is the precedence to be given to the parents of a newly ordained priest at his first Mass.

E. J. M.

## STANDING DURING "CREDO".

The server at Low Mass, if well-instructed, kneels during the *Credo*, but the people commonly stand. Is there any reason for this anomaly, or are there any definite rules on the subject? (P.)

## REPLY.

(i) During a solemn Mass or a *Missa Cantata* the people act correctly if they follow the choir on the Sanctuary, in sitting, kneeling and standing; e.g. during the *Credo* they stand whilst the celebrant recites it, and are seated when he and the choir are seated. But it is usually conceded that these rubrics which are preceptive for the choir are merely directive for the people. Nevertheless, it makes for order and stresses the unity of the people with the ministers at the altar, in assisting at the sacrifice, if these directive rubrics are observed at sung Masses. So far as our observation goes, they are observed in this country, and a foreign ecclesiastic who is a liturgist of repute records his satisfaction at what he saw here: "Considérez ces belles assemblées des Catholiques anglais assistant à la Messe à la Cathédrale de Westminster. Quelle vivante 'leçon de choses', quelle puissante affirmation de solidarité, de foi et de piété." So writes Canon Croegaert of Malines in an article on the correct ritual action of the faithful, the substance of an address given in 1933 at the Louvain *Semaine Liturgique*.<sup>1</sup>

(ii) During Low Mass the only rubrical direction on the subject is in *Rubricae Generales* of the Missal, xvii, n. 2: "Circumstantes autem in Missis Privatis semper genua flectunt, etiam Tempore Paschali, praeterquam dum legitur Evangelium." Relying on this rubric, the server at Low Mass is generally taught to kneel during the *Credo*, and there is not the slightest doubt that this is correct. But there is a custom in many places in this country for the server to stand, and many think it is a justifiable custom. Thus Dr. Calnan writes that it is the custom for the server

<sup>1</sup> *Participation Actives des Fidèles au Culte*, p. 129.

to stand in England and it is not exactly wrong.<sup>1</sup> Others say the practice of standing is "corrupt", a strong word to use for a fairly innocent action.<sup>2</sup> Assuming that the rubric quoted is preceptive and not merely directive for the server at Mass, we are of the opinion that kneeling is correct.<sup>3</sup>

The application of this argument to the people in the church is not so easy. The rubric is directive in their regard, and to observe it strictly would mean that they should be kneeling all the time except during the Gospel. No provision is made for being seated, but there is a universal custom of being seated from the Offertory to the Preface, and it would require a very brave and hopeful person to remove it. There is likewise a custom of standing during the Creed, and it seems proper to preserve this practice, not because of any express obligation from the rubrics, but for the sake of uniformity. In many places it is customary also for the people to rise whilst the celebrant is going to and from the altar. Canon Crogaert is in favour of the people standing both during the Creed and during the entry and exit of the celebrant. In addition, he suggests that they should stand during the Preface, but it would be unwise, in our view, to introduce this practice which is not usual in England.

E. J. M.

#### "I CHRISTEN THEE."

The moralists usually teach that the form of baptism, to be valid, must contain some word expressing ablution as the equivalent of the Latin "baptizo". It would, therefore, appear that "I christen" would be invalid, and that Catholics should not speak of a "christening" but of a "baptism". (X.)

#### REPLY.

The principle is that any word which, in the vernacular, is absolutely synonymous with "baptize" is valid. De Smet

<sup>1</sup> *Correct Mass-serving made easy*, Widdowson, 1936, p. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Fr. Page, *Practical Guide for Servers*, Burns Oates, 1934, p. 18.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1938, Vol. XIV, p. 440, for a discussion of the force of custom against the rubrics of the Missal. It is for the local Ordinary to determine whether such customs may be tolerated.

in *De Sacramentis*, p. 184, n. 1, cites the Flemish *kerstenen* and the English *christen* as examples of valid alternative words, and he notes that in 1894 the Holy See approved a Slavonic Ritual with *kristiti* in the vernacular form.

The pre-Reformation use in England seems to have been : "I Christen thee etc.", and this certainly continued for some time after the Reformation. In the museum at Old Hall is a *Ritual* printed at Douay by Laurence Kellam in 1610, and evidently meant for the use of the Seminary priests returning to England. It is entitled "Manuale Sacerdotum . . . juxta insignis Ecclesiae Sarisburensis". The only English form on page 63 is : "I Christen thee 'N' in the name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen" vel in lingua Latina sic : "Ego baptizo te 'N' in nomine etc." It will be noticed that the form contains "Amen", which is lacking in the modern rituals.

To be lawful the form in our present ritual : "I baptize thee etc." must always be used, but there cannot be any doubt that "I christen thee etc." is valid. E. J. M.

#### IMMODEST DRESS.

Where are the express instructions of the Church to be found with regard to the duty of parish priests in the matter of women's dress ?

F. N.

#### REPLY.

(1) The positive laws on the subject are given in an Instruction of the *Congregation of the Council*, 11 January, 1930.<sup>1</sup> After making some general references to the teaching of Holy Scripture, previous reproofs given by the Holy See, and the efforts of many local ordinaries directed against licentious modes of dress, in spite of derision and ridicule on the part of ill-disposed persons, the Sacred Congregation gives twelve rules. Some of these are of a general character, e.g. the need of reproof and vigilance

<sup>1</sup> A.A.S. 1930, XXII, p. 212; Eng. Tr. Bouscaren, *Digest*, p. 212.

and the duties of parents in this respect (nn. 1-3) ; others are directed to the superiors of Convents and other schools (nn. 4-6) ; pious associations of women are recommended for the purpose of influencing others by counsel and example to avoid immodest dress (n. 7). The matter is recommended especially to the diocesan Council of Vigilance which is instructed to discuss the question at least once a year (n. 11), and in the last rule, n. 12, Ordinaries are required, every three years, together with their report to the Holy See on religious instruction, to inform the Sacred Congregation on the measures that have been employed to secure the observance of the present Instruction.

Rules, 8, 9, and 10 affect the parochial clergy. Rule 8 directs that women who are immodestly dressed are to be excluded from pious associations. By this is evidently meant confraternities such as Children of Mary, and not, as Bouscaren implies in his English version, merely the pious associations referred to in rule 7 ; clearly women immodestly dressed could not belong to an association specially founded to remedy the abuse. The parish priest, or his delegate, is usually the director of women's confraternities, and it is well within his power to apply this rule.

Rule 9 states that girls and women immodestly dressed are to be refused Holy Communion and excluded from the office of sponsor at baptism and confirmation ; if judged necessary, they may be forbidden to enter the church (*si casus ferat, ab ipso ecclesiae ingressu prohibeantur*).

Rule 10 recommends exhortations to be given on the subject at opportune times, such as feasts of Our Lady, by priests in charge of Catholic societies and associations. Each year, if it is possible, there should be in cathedral and parish churches a similar exhortation to all the people on the feast of the Immaculate Conception.

(2) It will be observed that the Holy See, in this instruction, makes no attempt to define what is immodest dress. What the common law leaves undefined, local legislation, especially in France, often makes more explicit, and these directions of local Ordinaries are praised in the *proemium* to the rules, though none is referred to explicitly. Quite often these directions, which one may see posted at the doors of churches, forbid women to receive Holy Communion except

"en robe montant et fermée, bras couverts".<sup>1</sup> What is excluded at Holy Communion by these episcopal instructions is the scanty, open-necked, sleeveless blouse. This interpretation of the law is based on the practice at the Vatican, which refuses women admission to papal audiences when they present themselves so attired.<sup>2</sup> We do not know of any similar directions given by bishops in these islands.

(3) In so serious a matter as refusing the Sacraments, we are of the opinion that, in the absence of definite episcopal instructions, a priest acts rightly by avoiding severity in interpreting rule 9. He is certainly not entitled to refuse Holy Communion unless the dress of the person is certainly immodest, and he may not make the criterion existing in other countries his own rule of guidance. The terms of rule 8 can usually be observed by consulting the opinions of the *maior et senior pars* of the confraternity. In giving reproof and exhortation, in accordance with rules 1-3, he is entitled to do as his conscience directs, since the rights of the other party to the sacraments, etc., is not at stake. E. J. M.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Documentation Catholique*, 1922, Vol. VII, col. 1504—Bishop of Bayonne; 1928, Vol. XIX, col. 1564—Archbishop of Algiers; 1923, Vol. X, p. 538—Bishop of Montauban; 1935, Vol. XXXIII, col. 1458—Bishop of Arras.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Documentation Catholique*, 1923, Vol. X, col. 537.

## ROMAN DOCUMENTS

(i) *S. Cong. de Propaganda Fide* "De Catholica educatione prolis in missionibus" (*Commentarium pro Religiosis et Missionariis*, 1938, fasc. 2).

Excellentissime Domine,

*Dubia et explicationes a Te das circa peculiares difficultates, quae in istis regionibus ex consuetudinibus oriuntur contra catholicam educationem prolis, habitae vel nasciturae a neophy whole, ad Supremam S. C. S. Officii relata sunt.*

*Adiunctis a Te expositis rite examinatis, Sup. illa S. Congregatio, per litteras diei 19 elapsi mensis februarii, ita respondit :*

(1) *Utrum Missionarii baptizare possint parentes catachumenos, quorum proles major natu non vult converti ; aut qui super prolem minorem juxta mores terrae omne jus amiserunt, quia eam tradere tenentur parentibus suis paganis necnon mahometanis, qui impediunt educationem catholicam, et hac de causa ipsi (coniuges) conversionem aut educationem catholicam universae prolis promittere non possunt ;*

(2) *Utrum Missionarii in matrimonium conjungere possint catholicos qui iuxta mores terrae unam aut aliam prolem nascituram parentibus aut tutoribus paganis necnon mahometanis tradere tenentur, qui educationem catholicam impedire praevidentur ;*

(3) *Utrum valide dispensari possit super impedimento disparitatis cultus cum iis qui super maiores natu potestatem amiserunt, aut qui juxta mores terrae unam aliamve prolem nascituram parentibus aut tutoribus paganis necnon mahometanis tradere tenentur, qui educationem catholicam impedire praevidentur, et propter hoc contrahentes educationem catholicam universae prolis promittere non possunt.*

*Resp. :*

*Ad primum et ad secundum : Affirmative, dummodo partes paratae sint facere quod in se est ad fovendam conversionem et obtainendam catholicam educationem universae prolis ;*

*Ad tertium ; Affirmative quoad primam partem (seu quoad casus in quibus proles catholica jam est natu maior) ; quoad secundam partem (seu in aliis casibus) Affirmative, dummodo partes paratae sint facere quod in se est ad obtainendam catholicam educationem universae prolis.*

*Quo clarius Tibi fiat relatum S. Officii Decretum, exemplar*

hisce litteris inclusum datur notarum explicantium ab ipsa S. S.  
Congregatione S. Offici editorum.

Interim, faustissima quaeque adprecans, ea, qua par est,  
observantia maneo.

*Excellentiae tuae  
addictissimus in Domino*

(sign.) P. CARD. FUMASONI-BIONDI, *Praef.*

(sign.) † CELSUS COSTANTINI, *Secretarius.*

This reply of the Sacred Congregation, which is not published in A. A. S., is accompanied by an official commentary in which the solution given is justified on theological reasoning. The law of Canons 1061, 1071, 1113 and the sanctions of Canon 2319 § 1 apply without any reserve to those parents who neglect their obligations through their own fault, or who are found to be the cause of the education of their children outside of the Church. But if they are not in any way responsible, and if every marriage open to them is under the same objection, namely that they are prevented from securing effectively the Catholic education of their children, then their natural right to marry must be permitted. It is understood that they will do whatever is possible to observe the divine law, and the children may be baptized, but the law does not bind them to do what is impossible, nor are they rightly to be considered, in these circumstances, the cause of their children being brought up non-Catholics. By generating the children they co-operate, indeed, but it is material co-operation, in so far as the future education of the children is concerned; the celebration and the use of marriage in such cases is an action with a double effect, and is to be judged according to the familiar principle. The commentary concludes:

“Quapropter, quantumvis ex una parte fidelibus ac catechumenis gravissima parentum obligatio prolem catholice educandi inculcari debeat, ex altera parte eis non gravius onus imponendum est, quam auctor naturae et gratiae, Deus ipse, imposuit; neque ab iis exigendum est, ut, si postquam quae facere potuerunt fecerunt, ad catholicam educationem in tuto collocandam, eam obtinere non potuerunt, aut innupti maneat aut extent sacramentis et gratiis Ecclesiae privatis.”

E. J. M.

(ii) *Sacra Rituum Congregatio* : "Beatificationis et Canonizationis Venerabilis Servae Dei Franciscae Xaveriae Cabrini Instituti Sororum Missionariorum a S. Corde Iesu." (A.A.S. XXX, 1938, p. 289.)

SUPER DUBIO. An stante approbatione virtutum et duorum miraculorum "tuto" procedi possit ad sollempnem eiusdem Venerabilis Servae Dei Beatificationem . . . . Dubium hoc R̄m̄us Cardinalis Alexander Verde, Causae Ponens seu Relator, in Generali Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis coetu coram Sanctitate Sua in Apostolico Palatio apud Castrum Gandulphi die 2 mensis huius proposuit disceptandum. R̄m̄i Cardinales, Officiales Praelati, PP. Consultores omnes in affirmativam concessere sententiam. Beatissimus vero Pater suffragia haec benigne laetanterque exceptit, suam autem mentem in hanc diem aperire distulit 6 Augusti mensis, Transfigurationi D. N. I. C. sacram, qui quum sit *Candor Lucis Aeternae*, speculum sine macula et imago bonitatis illius (Sap. 7.26, in Missa Transfig.) suam hanc formam mire in Venerabili Francisca Xaveria impressit. Quocirca accitis R̄m̄is Cardinalibus Camillo Laurenti, S.R.C. Praefecto, atque Alexandro Verde, Causae Ponente seu Relatore, nec non R.P. Salvatore Natucci, Fidei Promotore Generali meque infrascripto Secretario, sacroque sancte litato edixit : "Tuto" procedi posse etc.

"Mother Cabrini", after testing her vocation in various Religious Institutes without success, founded in 1880 the *Institute of Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus*. The new Institute obtained its *Decretum Laudis* in 1888, and its definitive approbation in 1907. It is widely spread in America where there are over seventy houses devoted to education. Mother Cabrini died at Chicago in 1917 and the process for her beatification, begun in 1928, has now reached its final step. It is expected that the beatification will be on 13 November of this year. E. J. M.

## CHURCH MANAGEMENT

### STAINED GLASS

THIS matter falls very properly under the heading of "Church Management"; more particularly when it becomes a question of introducing stained glass into an already completed building. It is possible, by the action of "putting in a stained-glass window", either to enhance and beautify the interior, considered as an architectural and aesthetic unity; or to introduce into it a damaging and disharmonizing, if not positively a vulgar and permanently disfiguring feature.

From this point of view, careful approach to the problem is a necessity; if only because, by its very nature, stained glass is capable of a degree of such damage as far in excess of that of a picture or a statue, as the power of transmitted light exceeds that of reflected light; probably at least ten times. Yet it is precisely the manner of approach which is very often the determining factor in the nature of the final result. It may express itself first in wrong choice of subject; secondly, in looking for examples in the wrong quarters; and lastly, and almost inevitably, in a misplacement of the work, in the sense of entrusting it to the wrong type of person. The whole undesirable train of consequences follows, in nearly every case from the very common mistake of regarding a stained-glass window, in the same way as a picture; or, in fact, positively as a picture.

Yet the real nature of the whole case remains in this: that pictorial art is one thing, and the art of stained glass is another; and that the points of contact between them are really surprisingly few. It may be said that the attempt to render pictorial effects in the rigid medium of glass and lead involves first a disregard of the lead, and secondly a misuse of the glass. This follows from the fact that the only way in which pictorial effects (e.g. of elaborate shading; imitative treatment of flesh, draperies, and accessories; tone and perspective) can be achieved upon glass is by disregarding the very nature of the medium, and suppressing exactly those intrinsic qualities which give it all its value and its beauty. In a word, it is impossible, if the effects of a

painted picture are aimed at, for the glass in a stained-glass window to "tell" as glass. For the necessity of covering every part of every piece with the painting-pigment, to obtain the necessary flatness of surface for the desired "picture", robs the whole window of the suggestion that it is made of glass at all ; and conveys rather the suggestion of a poor drawing on oiled silk or paper. It is quite accurate to say that "pictorial" stained glass is a technical monstrosity ; because, by doing violence in the first place to the limitations (or, more truly, to the intrinsic qualities) of glass and lead, it ends by being neither one thing nor the other. It is not a good picture—the thickness and weight of the ineluctable lead-line and the inevitable presence of iron bars preclude that ; nor can it possibly be good stained glass, because it has been undertaken from the start in a spirit of evasion and disregard of the essential property of glass, which is to shine and glitter—in fact, to *look* like glass.

The window of stained and leaded glass, properly conceived and carried out, can be an extremely beautiful thing ; it can enhance and *decorate* an interior with a beauty of shimmering light, or of colour—tender and iridescent, sparkling and jewel-like, or solemn and mysteriously glowing—in a way possible to no other form of art facture. It is a great pity then, to see so many cases in which the opportunity to attain such beauty—in a world where it is all too rare as it is—has been sacrificed, merely because the matter has been approached in the wrong way. One can think of so many windows, permanently robbed of their character as windows by being filled with a bad "picture"—those terrible masses of flaring red drapery in so many figures of the Sacred Heart, St. Francis in hot gravy-brown, St. Benedict in the violet-black of an inferior ink ! What is there left to suggest a window, an opening for the admission of *light* ?

The beauty peculiar to glass and lead can only be attained by conceiving of stained glass in the same way that the glaziers (and, it may be added, the clergy and the people and the donors of windows) of the great mediaeval cathedrals conceived of it. In their eyes it was, first of all, a form of decoration for the building, to which it added that peculiar kind of beauty proper to glass and lead alone. To them, it was first of all a vibrating and iridescent *web* of shimmering

material *hung* in the window-opening, through which the light of day entered the building softened, beautified, and transformed. Or, as often, it was a gorgeously patterned fabric of colour, cunningly chosen and skilfully combined, in which the light was caught and *held* in the opening, made to hang there in the dark wall-spaces as a mysterious and complex texture of glowing colour. One cannot do better than to quote here the words of the late Prof. W. R. Lethaby : (*Mediaeval Art*, p. 176) :

"I am forced to say that the window of dyed glass is the most perfect art form known . . ." "Such windows were not depicted merely in transparent colours, as we are apt to think ; but from the thickness, texture, and quality of the old glass it holds the sunlight, as it were, within it, so that the whole becomes a mosaic of coloured fire. The 'pitch' of the colour is the intensest conceivable, and stimulates the sensibilities like an exultant anthem. One feels that this dazzling mixture of blue and ruby was made use of by a deeper instinct than taste."

It was in terms of such effects as these in the first place that the mediaeval craftsman and his employers conceived stained glass ; regarding it in the second place only, as a vehicle for certain dogmatic and didactic subject-matter. It is the modern habit of putting things in the reverse order, which has produced so much poor and often deplorable stained glass ; which has created, in a word, that purely modern anomaly, the "pictorial stained-glass window" ; such a pitiful exchange for the shimmering, jewel-set silver of the York "Five Sisters", or the solemn glories of Chartres.

JOHN TRINICK.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Julie Billiart and her Institute.* By Sister F. de Chantal, S.N.D.  
(Longmans. Pp. x + 280. 7s. 6d.)

*Anne-Elizabeth Seton.* By Jeanne Danemarie. (Crasset, Paris. Pp. 220. 18 fr.)

THESE biographies make an interesting study in similarities and contrasts. They describe the lives of two contemporary Foundresses who reached the same goal by very different ways, who did much the same work for God, although greatly differing in their methods and means. The women themselves are poles apart in everything but their perfect charity. Julie Billiart was a poor, unlettered French peasant possessing nothing but her faith to help her in her work ; Mother Seton was a wealthy, cultured society lady, a belle of New York and a convert to the Church, who sacrificed most things that the world deems desirable in order to find heaven and take others there with her. These women never met, but they would have been firm friends without a word of introduction, so perfectly did each understand how to fulfil the law of Christ by perfect charity.

Julie Billiart was raised up by God to repair the ravages made in child education by the French Revolution. How well she succeeded is proved by the wonderful spread of her Institute throughout the world. To read about the beginning of her work, with year after year of heartbreaking disappointment, tests one's faith in the possibility of a happy ending to the story ; but to see pictures of the numerous magnificent schools in every continent forces one to acknowledge the miraculous element in the amazing growth of Notre Dame. Everyone but the Foundress herself lost heart. She went on as bravely as ever when all hope had long been abandoned, still trusting in the good God Who had called her, and never doubting the ultimate completion of her task. Every child in need was a claim upon her care, and the greatness of her achievement may be judged from the fact that girls in all classes of society are today educated by her daughters.

Very different from the infancy of Julie Billiart were the early years of Mother Seton. She knew from the beginning the happiness that one expects to find in the life of a beautiful,

talented, and noble-minded girl, brought up by loving parents. She was soon surrounded by a devoted husband and adoring children, but her husband's long illness and lingering death in their turn brought sorrow, which was deepened when some of her dearest friends forsook her upon her reception into the Church. Trials served but to confirm her in grace. She sacrificed everything to establish her community; and today her daughters in the United States number nearly ten thousand. The life of this thoroughly American woman is a romance of holiness, which it is hoped will culminate in her canonization.

Julie Billiart is already raised to God's altars. She has been the subject of many biographies, but this new one (extremely well written and produced) bringing the Foundations of the Institute up to date, is the most pleasing we have yet seen. Mother Seton is no less fortunate in her biographer. The vivacity and interest of Mlle Danemarie's style encourages the reader to overlook such blemishes as misprints and unevenness of type, especially as the book is in such simple French that it may be read without a dictionary at one's elbow. It was a happy inspiration that prompted the writing of each of these volumes. L. T. H.

*Fairest Lord Jesus.* By J. V. Moldenhawer. (Putnam. Pp. 191. 5s.)

HERE is a volume of sermons upon faith in Christ, by the minister of New York's First Presbyterian Church. They speak in telling terms of the author's devotion for the person of our Saviour, and they breathe a spirit of charity that warms the heart, but they also cause one to ask: "What manner of faith is this?" There is no explained doctrine, no mention of sacrifice or Sacraments, no word of Our Lady, Purgatory, Prayer, the Virtues, or of any of those matters which make for an instructed faith. Dr. Moldenhawer seems to believe in Christ's divinity, yet he nowhere says quite clearly: "Christ is God." His religion is of a hearty, happy type, founded upon the Synoptic Gospels, but repudiating the Gospel of St. John, so that one is left in a state of deep speculation as to whether this faith is deserving of the name of Christianity. The author has evidently opened the Scriptures, and in parts thereof found his

religion. But faith, the faith of St. Paul and Catholic Christianity, comes by hearing—by hearing the sure, unfailing voice of God, when His Church speaks with divine authority, to explain His doctrine.

L. T. H.

*Dom Guéranger.* Introduction de Louis Dimier. (Paris Desclée de Brouwer & Cie. Pp. lxviii + 452. No price stated.)

THIS book is one of a very useful series published under the general title *Choisir Les Meilleurs Textes*, with the object of recalling some of the great Catholic writers of the past. The method is to give in an introduction a rapid survey of the life of the author, and then to reproduce characteristic extracts from his work. This is particularly valuable in the case of the writings of the great apostle of the revival of the liturgy and of the Benedictine Order in France, for the Guéranger of the fight for Roman unity in the liturgy, the critic of the worst evil of the nineteenth century, the Abbot of Solesmes who, from afar, surveyed the discussions and struggles of the Vatican Council, has, in this country at any rate, been lost behind the more peaceable and sublime author of *The Liturgical Year*. M. Dimier explains the setting of these old disputes, and gives long extracts from *Les Institutions Liturgiques*, the essay on the work of M. de Broglie, and other writings dealing with the Papal monarchy and the then vexed question of Infallibility. The book has an excellent Index and gives an exhaustive bibliography of Dom Guéranger's works.

A. B.

*Religion and Life in the Early Victorian Age.* By E. E. Kellett, M.A. (The Epworth Press. Pp. 174. 5s.)

THE title of this book is slightly presumptuous, for it is little more than a sketch, well-written and companionable, of that aspect of Victorian life which came within the experience of a young Methodist of somewhat severe upbringing. Mr. Kellett writes in a pleasant and graceful style, has a fund of apt illustrations and anecdotes, and, because he does not attempt too much, gives a lively picture of a corner of Victorian English life well worth reproduction. Two things stand out very clearly from these pages—the stunning effect

of the new biblical criticism on the minds of devout but uninstructed Bible readers of the later nineteenth century ; and the general lack of an adequate social philosophy among both the laity and the ministers of Methodism. There were many of these men to whom the social problem was no problem at all ; they were content with a religion which "gave them a God whom they could worship without embarrassment"—and not too many questions asked.

A. B.

*The Christmas Crib.* By Nesta de Robeck. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 8s. 6d.)

THE Christmas Crib is familiar to everyone ; its history is not so well known. For this reason Miss de Robeck's book is a welcome addition to our scanty literature on the subject. With infinite care and patience, the author traces the history of the devotion from the earliest times down to the present day. She divides her book into three parts—the pre-Franciscan Crib, the Renaissance Crib, and the Later Crib. In the first part she pieces together with no little skill the story of the devotion, which began in Bethlehem itself, was established later at St. Mary Major's in Rome, and was fostered by various means in the West, chiefly by the Nativity Play. The licence of the latter brought it under the ban of the Church. But not for long. St. Francis of Assisi re-established the Crib at Greccio. He stripped it of the trivialities and profanities, the accretion of centuries, which tended to obscure the main subject, and, by reducing it to the simplicity of the original, focused attention on the Child Jesus. For him Christmas was the feast of the "Gran Piccolino Gesu", and it is to him that all credit must be given for replacing the Bambino in the crib and making it the centre of our Christmas devotions. Although the exuberance of the Renaissance destroyed the simplicity of the Franciscan crib and occasionally introduced a discordant note, the "Little Lord Jesus" still remained the focal-point of Christian rejoicing at Christmas-time. Not even the Reformation could kill the enthusiasm of the faithful, though it certainly sobered it, and post-Reformation Germany gave us the simple, homely, domestic crib.

The value of this book is enhanced by a series of delightful full-page photographs of cribs ancient and modern. In particular, one would call attention to the Neapolitan and German cribs. Although in both cases they have wandered far from the simplicity of the Nativity scene on the Screen at Chartres and might be criticized by some as being over-elaborate and too fussy, nevertheless the settings are delicious and the carvings truly magnificent.

Both author and publisher are to be congratulated on an excellent production. The story is well told, in good print, on stout paper. It will make an ideal Christmas present.

W. P. S.

*A Sicilian Borromeo.* By a Benedictine of Stanbrook Abbey.  
(Burns Oates & Washbourne. 7s. 6d.)

*Prince of Pastors.* By Margaret Yeo. (Longmans. 7s. 6d.)

ONE of the most conspicuous monuments of Catania is the fine statue erected to the memory of the saintly Cardinal Archbishop Dusmet, O.S.B. The inscription it bears tells of his heroic charity to the poor. That record is fully borne out by the details of his life given in this book. No sacrifice was too great for him when it was a question of relieving the distress of his people. As a Benedictine monk of the famous abbey of San Martino delle Scale at Monreale he practised strict observance in the midst of laxity, and his experience there made him a zealous though ever kindly reformer. On his elevation to the See of Catania he continued to practise poverty, and even as a Cardinal he lived in the greatest simplicity. He was a capable administrator in very difficult times. Not only did he rule his diocese with zeal and discretion, but he negotiated successfully with the anticlerical forces who had invaded the Church's possessions, and won the admiration and respect of Garibaldi himself. His memory is still green among his faithful Catanese who confidently look forward to the day when Holy Church may set her seal on the heroicity of his virtues. The anonymous Benedictine nun who has written this Life is to be congratulated on having produced a book as interesting and informative as it is edifying.

It is only when one goes on to read of the original

Borromeo of Milan in Mrs. Yeo's glowing pages that one questions the appropriateness of the title given to Cardinal Dusmet. Born in a fortress like an eyrie over Lake Maggiore, St. Charles had an aquiline quality about him unshared by the Archbishop of Catania. That formidable nose gave fair warning to any who should oppose the reform which was the great work of his career. Mrs. Yeo tells dramatically the sensational story of the saint's rise to power on the accession of his uncle Pius IV, the almost miraculous competence he showed as the young Secretary of State, his eager withdrawal to his diocese at the death of his uncle, his forceful victory over Spanish governors and Milanese councillors, and his conquest of the hearts of his clergy and people by his sanctity, self-sacrifice and pastoral devotion. Very skilfully she introduces us to such interesting personalities as Pius IV, shrewd, tolerant, rather worldly wise, corpulent, eager for his daily walk with his emaciated nephew through the streets of Rome ; St. Pius V, the ex-inquisitor, as determined as Charles himself on reform ; St. Philip Neri, a life-long friend of the young Cardinal ; Lainez, the second General of the Jesuits. But the chief value of the book lies in the arresting and convincing delineation of the Saint's growth in holiness from a pious, hard-working but rather dull boy to the heroic example of zeal, penitence and charity which has won for him the title of Model of Bishops.

T. E. F.

*Sermons in the Sahara. The Missionary Spirit.* By Charles de Foucauld. Translated by Donald Attwater. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1938. 2s. 6d.)

ONE of the major criticisms of our present methods of religious instruction is that they inform the mind but do not train the will, that is, they teach a child *about* Mass, for example, but do not make him *want* to go to Mass. If this is true it will explain why so many do not go after they leave school.

It is quite relevant to associate our grave domestic problem of leakage with a book of *Sermons in the Sahara*, for Charles de Foucauld was giving religious instruction, the

substance of which, apart from the sanctity of the preacher, is a model of simple, clear and *effective* Christian teaching. There are twenty-one carefully prepared little homilies and they cover the more important truths of Catholic faith and morals. It is, however, the constant doubling back to a personal application of every point, so that it matters to the hearer, that makes the difference. An apostle, and not a mere teacher, speaks, nor does it seem difficult for any teacher to become something of an apostle if he adopted this method.

The secret of it is the missionary spirit, so marked in Père Gorrée's *Memories of Charles de Foucauld*, already recommended in these columns, and now showing in de Foucauld's own instructions to his little group of neophytes in North Africa. They begin and end every talk with the "Our Father" and the hermit's own prayer : "O God, bring all men to heaven. Amen." Their teacher remembers that his hearers may themselves impart to others the instruction he has given, and speaks accordingly, for he will not have them hearers and not doers of the word, deceiving themselves. He therefore tries to reach at once the mind and the will.

It is all done with expert simplicity. The publishers recommend *Sermons in the Sahara* as a text-book for missionary priests ; a bolder venture would be to take it as a text-book for Catholic teachers, make a prayerful experiment with it and astonish ourselves, as we undoubtedly should, at its success.

GEORGE TELFORD.

*How to Keep Well.* By Mary G. Cardwell, M.D. (*The Psychologist*, Mansfield House, Southampton Street, W.C.2. Paper cover. 1s.)

BASED on fundamentally sound principles, *How to Keep Well*, by Mary G. Cardwell, M.D., should appeal to all who appreciate simplicity and common sense. The study of guides to health by the layman is accompanied usually by a depression of spirit or a morbid delight in one's own symptoms, but this small volume is really healthy literature, refreshing and invigorating, and the final chapter on the happy mental outlook is probably the best in the book.

J. K.

*De Hysterectomiae uteri gravidi morbos liceitate (Collectanea Mechliniensia, August-September 1938).*

An Italian gynaecologist, writing in the *Osservatore Romano* (1931), defended the proposition that the operation of removing a diseased womb was *in se* lawful and the death of the fetus resulted as the second effect, which could be permitted. He had in his support the opinion of Vermeersch. Dr. Gemelli denied the lawfulness of the operation and there resulted a long controversy between them, chiefly in *Periodica* and in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*. The broad outlines of the arguments on both sides are given in this article, which is a resumé of a full-dress debate in the Malines Seminary under the presidency of the Cardinal Archbishop. In referring to the matter, during the course of the Gemelli-Vermeersch discussion, we have expressed the opinion in this journal that all the arguments were against Gemelli. This very clear summary of the dispute, set out in the form of a thesis defended and objections answered, confirms our view. The death of the fetus is not sought as a means to an end, as is always the case in therapeutic abortion, but it follows upon a lawful operation which would have to be performed even though the womb were not pregnant. Not only may we say that the view of Vermeersch may be prudently defended as a probable opinion, but it is now clear that his view is the common teaching of contemporary theologians. A full bibliography, chiefly contributions to periodicals, is given.

E. J. M.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### GRADINES

Fr. J. L. Whitfield writes :

In writing about altar gradines "No question about them has ever been put to the S.C.R. They have not been permitted, recommended, or forbidden" (p. 458) Geoffrey Webb would seem to have overlooked the affirmative reply given on 5 December, 1891 (Decr. Authent. S.R.C. 3759), to the query whether at low Mass the two candles *locari possint etiam super gradum superiore ejusdem (altaris)*.

### PAROCHIAL BENEFICES

CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. XV, Nos. 3 and 5.

"S" writes :

Is one to understand from Dr. McReavy that the faithful in England when making their "Church Offerings" :

(1) Do not or cannot do so to the Parish Priest with the intention that he administer them as he thinks best and according to the trust they have in him ?

(2) That they do or must make such offerings binding the Parish Priest in justice in the administration ?

(3) That the faithful of England do not or cannot intend their Parish Priests to have similar rights and privileges to the Parish Priests in other parts of the world ?

One thing is apparent from the writings of Dr. McReavy, namely, that to some the process of elimination of individuality or liberty in a secular priest is not yet sufficient—and that in spite of the elimination of personal home, personal furniture in many cases, and the possession of a decent living without accounting for its particulars to anyone.

Whatever case there be for private ownership and personal individual rights, such is being reduced to a minimum for priests, simultaneously with their isolation

from and restriction in the life of the community and the multiplication of duties and obligations upon them.

Would not more trust and less suspicion, more of the spirit and less of the letter be desirable in the next Plenary Synod referred to by Dr. McReavy?

S.

Dr. McReavy writes in reply :

In my recent article on *Parochial Benefices*, as also in my answer to the objections of "Parochus" (C.R. Sept., p. 189; Oct., p. 376; Nov., p. 468), my only object was to apply the rules of Canon Law, as interpreted by responsible canonists, to the special circumstances obtaining here in England. The principles which I enunciated were not of my making, but the legislator's, and the interpretations which I gave were, to the best of my knowledge, the generally admitted interpretations. If, therefore, as "S" maintains, they further restrict what "S" considers to be the already unduly restricted liberty of the parish priest, that is the legislator's responsibility, not mine.

This, of course, does not mean that I accept the complaint of "S" as justified. It seems to me that the Church, in allowing the parish priest to take from the parochial revenues an honest maintenance, proportioned to his needs and to the means of the parish, and a stipend defined by diocesan law to cover his incidental expenses, has not only dealt with him fairly, but has also allowed him a degree of liberty enjoyed by few men of the world. Not many are free, as he is free, to estimate for themselves the amount they may fairly appropriate from a common fund. "S" asks for "more trust and less suspicion". I fail to see how the Church could trust him further or suspect him less, except, perhaps, by decreeing that all parochial revenue whatsoever should be his own personal property, and trusting him to show reasonable charity to the needs of his parish. It is true that a parish priest may occasionally be prevented by the poverty of his parish from obtaining the full measure of maintenance to which he has a right. That, I admit, is a regrettable restriction of his liberty, but it is a restriction imposed by local circumstances, not by the law.

To the three questions put by "S", as to what the faithful can be supposed to intend in making their offerings, I answer that the faithful, as loyal members of the Church, must be presumed to intend that their undetermined offerings be determined and administered according to the laws of the Church. Even if they were more explicit and took to labelling their offerings (so much for the maintenance of the parish priest and so much for the needs of the parish), it would not substantially alter the position of our parish priests either in law or in fact. There are many countries in which such a distinction is made, so that the parish priest's maintenance money is a definite sum, distinct even in its origin from the general church monies; and yet even there, by canon 1473, he may only use as much of this sum as is necessary for his honest maintenance, and must devote the rest to charity. The English system of undetermined offerings to a common fund may preclude the possibility of a maintenance surplus earmarked for charity, but that is all the real difference it makes, it does not prevent the parish priest from including reasonable charity in his estimate of his own and his parish's needs. That, I think, is sufficient answer to the implication behind question number three.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

## BOOKS RECEIVED

PRE-REFORMATION ENGLAND. By H. Maynard Smith, D.D. (Oxon), Canon of Gloucester. (London : Macmillan. 556 pp. 25s.)

THE TRAINING OF THE WILL. By Johann Lindworsky, S.J. Revised edition. (London : G. E. J. Coldwell. 173 pp. 8s. 6d.)

WHY THE CROSS? By Edward Leen, C.S. Sp. (London : Sheed & Ward. 366 pp. 7s. 6d.)

A COMPANION TO THE SUMMA. Vol. II : The Pursuit of Happiness. By Walter Farrell, O.P. (London : Sheed & Ward. 459 pp. 10s. 6d.)

OUR KNOWLEDGE OF MARY. A Short Treatise of Mariology by Very Rev. William Joseph Chaminade. (London : G. E. J. Coldwell. 108 pp. 3s.)

NENNIIUS'S "HISTORY OF THE BRITONS". By A. W. Wade-Evans. (London : S.P.C.K. 156 pp. 7s. 6d.)

AN OUTLINE OF CHURCH HISTORY, from the Acts of the Apostles to the Reformation. Edited by Caroline Duncan-Jones. (London : Allen & Unwin. 157 pp. 4s. 6d.)

PURITANISM AND LIBERTY. Being the Army Debates (1647-9) from the Clarke MSS. Selected and edited by A. S. P. Woodhouse. (London : Dent. 506 pp. 18s.)

MONARCHY. A Study of Louis XIV. By Hilaire Belloc. (London : Cassell. 392 pp. 12s. 6d.)

THE POOR AND OURSELVES. By Daniel-Rops. Translated by Barbara Wall. (London : Burns Oates & Washbourne. 83 pp. 2s. 6d.)

A LIFE OF OUR LORD. By Vincent McNabb, O.P. (London : Sheed & Ward. 198 pp. 6s.)

JEANNE D'ARC. Par Général S. Visconti-Prasca. Traduit de l'Italien par Jean Godfrin. Préface du Général Weygand. (Paris : Beauchesne. 234 pp.)

THE UNITY OF PHILOSOPHICAL EXPERIENCE. By Etienne Gilson. (London : Sheed & Ward. 340 pp. 10s. 6d.)

THE GREAT HERESIES. By Hilaire Belloc. (London : Sheed & Ward. 277 pp. 7s. 6d.)

MINT BY NIGHT. Poems. By Alfred Barrett, S.J. (New York : America Press. 65 pp. \$1.50.)

---

---

## SOME CONTRIBUTORS TO THE NEW CATHOLIC HERALD

PETER F. ANSON  
G. ELLIOT ANSTRUTHER, K.S.G.  
DONALD ATTWATER  
REV. BERNARD BASSETT, S.J.  
MICHAEL DE LA BEDOYERE  
HILAIRE BELLOC  
J. L. BENVENISTI  
JOHN BETJEMAN  
W. J. BLYTON  
TANCRED BORENIUS  
FRANCIS BRAND  
JOHN BROWN  
RT. REV. MGR. WILLIAM F.  
BROWN  
REV. FRANCIS BURDETT  
REV. GEORGE BURNS, S.J.  
EGERTON CLARKE  
LORD CLONMORE  
IRIS CONLAY  
SUSAN CUNNINGTON  
ALICE CURTAINE  
REV. MARTIN C. D'ARCY, S.J.  
MICHAEL DERRICK  
LORD ALFRED DOUGLAS  
REV. FRANCIS H. DRINKWATER  
REV. EUSTACE DUDLEY, S.J.  
H. O. EVERETT  
REV. DENIS FAHEY  
REV. THOMAS GILBY, O.P.  
ERIC GILL  
G. M. GODDEN  
RT. REV. MGR. GOODIER, S.J.  
WALDEMAR GURIAN  
M. V. HAY  
F. R. HOARE  
PROFESSOR JOHN HOWLEY  
REV. JOSEPH H. HOWARD  
RT. REV. MGR. JACKMAN  
STANLEY B. JAMES  
J. M. N. JEFFRIES  
DOUGLAS JERROLD  
HUMPHREY JOHNSON  
RT. REV. MGR. RONALD KNOX  
WILFRED ROOKESLEY  
ARNOLD LUNN  
CANON MAHONEY, D.D.  
REV. C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J.  
REV. GERVASE MATHEW, O.P.  
MARQUIS MERRY DEL VAL  
CHARLES G. MORTIMER  
DOM B. McELLIGOTT, O.S.B.  
PAUL B. MCGUIRE  
REV. VINCENT McNABB, O.P.  
DOUGLAS NEWTON  
ALFRED NOYES  
DR. W. O'DONOVAN  
SEAN O'FAOLAIN  
REV. LEO O'HEA, S.J.  
PROFESSOR A. O'RAHILLY  
DR. WILLIAM E. ORCHARD  
RICHARD O'SULLIVAN, K.C.  
REV. HUGH POPE, O.P.  
REV. EDWARD QUINN  
PROFESSOR LOUIS RENOUF  
GERALD WYNNE RUSHTON  
ROBERT SENCOURT  
F. J. SHEED  
WALTER SHEWRING  
REV. JOHN V. SIMCOX  
ROBERT SPEAGHT  
REV. ROBERT STEUART, S.J.  
PROFESSOR W. F. P. STOCKLEY  
HALLIDAY SUTHERLAND  
PETER THOMPSON  
DR. W. R. THOMPSON, F.R.S.  
REV. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.  
REV. GERALD VANN, O.P.  
BERNARD WALL  
REV. LEO WARD  
W. I. WATKIN  
EVELYN WAUGH  
STEPHANIE WINES  
REV. FRANCIS WOODLOCK, S.J.  
MARGARET YEO

# THE NEW CATHOLIC HERALD

Every Friday

From All Newsagents  
Price 2d.

---

---

# Gift Books

---

## THE CHRISTMAS CRIB

Traces the devotion to the crib from the early years of the Church and describes the increasing elaboration and magnificence of its artistic expression during the Renaissance and the eighteenth century.

*Nesta de Robeck*  
38 Illustrations, 8s. 6d.

## THE GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST

*M. J. Lagrange, O.P.*  
2 vols., 10s. 6d. each.

## A LAYMAN'S CHRISTIAN YEAR

A series of essays on the liturgy which covers the whole year, interpreting for the laity the ancient ritual and liturgy of the Church. With an introduction by Abbot Vonier.

*Ernest Oldmeadow*  
7s. 6d.

## FAITH AND COMMONSENSE

Popular short sermons. A companion volume to *Things Temporal and Timeless* and *Reason and Religion*.

*Canon J. Arendzen, D.D., Ph.D.*  
6s.

## SISTER MARIE DE ST. PIERRE

This biography reveals Sister St. Pierre as the forerunner of the Little Flower who had already learnt and lived the doctrine of Spiritual Childhood which St. Thérèse was later to propagate under her influence.

*Sister M. Emmanuel, O.S.B.*  
5s.

## THE SUNDAY EPISTLES EXPLAINED

*Rev. E. C. Messenger, Ph.D.*  
6s.

---

## BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE

# Annuals for 1939

---

## THE CATHOLIC DIRECTORY

The Official Organ of the English Hierarchy

102nd Year of Publication

A Compendium of all necessary information as to  
the Catholic Church in Great Britain

Cr. 8vo                    Over 1000 pages                    Cloth, 3s 6d.

---

## THE CATHOLIC WHO'S WHO

Contains more than 5000 brief biographies of  
prominent Catholics in the British Empire

Cr. 8vo                    Cloth, 6s.

---

## THE CATHOLIC ALMANACK

A complete Ecclesiastical Kalendar for pocket or  
desk, with much other valuable information

Wrapper, 2d.

---

## THE CATHOLIC DIARY

A day-to-a-page pocket Diary, with Ecclesiastical  
Kalendar

Cloth, 1s.                    Leather, 2s. 6d.

---

**BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE**





# The Universe

*The most widely-read  
Catholic paper*

THE CLERGY will find in "The Universe" the most comprehensive news of Catholic affairs throughout the world, supplied by authoritative representatives in practically every country.

THE CLERGY will find the official announcements of the dioceses of Great Britain faithfully and promptly recorded, and all news of nation-wide interest for the progress of the Catholic cause fully presented.

THE CLERGY will find representative and central Catholic opinion upon topics of the day voiced both editorially and by expert writers upon the subjects concerned.

THE CLERGY will find in "The Universe" the best medium of publicity for announcements, appeals and small advertisements.

*Its sale exceeds by many thousands the combined sale of all other Catholic papers printed in Great Britain and Ireland.*

•  
TWOPENCE WEEKLY  
BY POST 12s. 6d. PER YEAR

•

184 STRAND, LONDON, W.C.2

# BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE

*Publishers to the Holy See*

The PREMIER HOUSE for  
CHURCH FURNITURE  
WOODCARVING and  
DEVOTIONAL REQUISITES

ROSARIES  
STATUES  
PICTURES  
CARDS AND  
CALENDARS—CRUCIFIXES  
FONTS—FIRST COMMUNION  
MEMORIALS — PRIE-DIEU  
BIBLES, NEW  
TESTAMENTS  
PRAYER  
BOOKS AND  
GENERAL  
CATHOLIC  
LITERATURE

*Catalogues of Books, Church Furniture, and Devotional Articles  
sent post free on request*

30-32 Manchester Street, Liverpool; 39 John Bright Street, Birmingham;  
66-68 Bridge Street, Manchester; 248 Buchanan Street, Glasgow;  
21-22 D'Olier Street, Dublin;

43-45 Newgate Street, E.C.1 LONDON 129 Victoria Street, S.W.1

